

coverage? Where are their new ideas to reduce the huge national deficit which happened on their watch leaving our children and grandchildren with debt as far as the eye can see?

Madam Speaker, Democrats have new ideas and are ready to lead this House.

TAX CUTS OR VETERAN BENEFITS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, a group of House Republicans last week seriously undermined our Nation's ability to fight the war on terror when they objected to more than \$500 million in funding that directly affects our veterans and our soldiers in combat. These were all funds the President said were necessary to properly fund military construction projects and our veterans services. And yet the House Republican leadership allowed these funds to be stripped from the bill by not properly funding these programs in the budget they passed last week.

This small group of House Republicans would not have been able to act against our troops and our veterans if the Republican leadership had been honest about their real funding needs in their budget. House Republicans want Americans to believe that they can continue to provide \$40,000 tax breaks every year to millionaires without negatively impacting critical Federal obligations. But Memorial Day approaches this weekend, House Republicans need to decide whether they want to continue to stick with the wealthiest few or if they want to level with the American people about our true financial commitment to our military and our veterans. It is time they choose.

AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY AND GOOD JOBS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 835 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 835

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5429) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman

from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 835 provides for a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources, waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and provides for one motion to recommit.

This rule allows this body to, once again, consider important legislation which is a key component of moving our Nation further along towards greater energy independence.

H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act is appropriately titled. It highlights the fact that the United States has within its borders vast untapped natural energy resources which have been locked away largely because of surreal political rhetoric battles, not based on reality, and it highlights the fact that developing this energy would provide many new jobs to our national economy and support our existing domestic economy.

We drive. We use plastics. Our agriculture uses fertilizers. 90 percent of our food is trucked to us. This is indeed talking about our economic health.

I know in the rhetoric that will take place there will be some emotional consideration that will happen. But I think also in the rhetoric, we will find several facts that will emerge.

Fact number one is there is oil in this area. The U.S. Geological Survey, our own researchers have stated with the probability that is higher than any of the pollsters who will be using our campaigns will say, that there is a minimum of 4.2 billion barrels and a mean factor of 8 billion barrels of oil. They have clearly stated this is the largest on-shore source of petroleum we have in the United States. If this were the only source of energy that we were using, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS' State, could go for 29 years of energy needs in his State of Florida just with this source alone. My State uses far less air conditioning. We could go for 218 years just from this source alone.

□ 1100

A second fact that will come through. The purpose of this land is for oil exploration. When I first came here, there was a campaign to try and discredit drilling up in this area. They showed pictures of mountains, lush conifers, forests, lakes, meadows. It was a good PR campaign. It would have been a perfect PR campaign if it was true. They were actually using pictures in this area.

Secretary Norton said in the congressional committee in March of 2003, this

is a coastal plain. It is called a coastal plain because it is a plain. There are no mountains, there are no deep water lakes, there are no trout streams. The only trout you will find in this area is frozen.

When Jimmy Carter and the Democrat-controlled legislature of Congress at the time created the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area the size of South Carolina. They also created the section known as 10/02. That is not ANWR.

When we were having 10 percent inflation and 10 percent unemployment at the same time, they created an area the size of the State of Delaware if you include the water for the purpose of oil exploration. It was stated at the time that this is where our future energy supply would come. Well, the future is now.

What we are talking about is a million and a half acres, the size of Delaware, with a displacement potential of around 2,000 acres to capture the energy in this particular area. That is roughly the size from the Capitol down to the Air and Space Museum on the lawn, out of an area the size of the State of Delaware. Mathematically, that comes to about .13 percent of the land that is available. Those are like finger clippings that we are talking about.

Fact number three: The locals who live on this land, who know the land and who love the land, are almost in unanimous support of this proposition.

Fact number four: When we created the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and this 10/02 section for oil exploration, we also made other decisions that increased our oil dependence on foreign sources, specifically from countries who do not like to play nice. What we have done by doing that is limit our diplomatic options. We have limited our independence. We have limited our freedom of action, and the only way to reverse that is to by creating clear oil independence, and that is an important step to do it.

So, for 11 times since 1995, we have passed in this body with a bipartisan vote of support drilling in this 10/02 section of land, and that was when the price of gas was cheap. We are now coming together for a 12th time with, once again, I hope bipartisan support to pass this effort. After all, it took Jacob 12 times to produce Joseph. I am convinced that we today on our 12th try will produce something as noble as that.

Now, there are some reasons for some people who do not want to do this. I consider it somewhat of an attitude issue. Sometimes we oversimplify our life. We think of the world as either black and white, yes or no, right or wrong, left or right, and do not recognize the shades of differences that are in between.

What our constituents want us to do is to reach across the aisle and in a bipartisan way try and solve an energy problem, understanding there are

shades. There is not one right or wrong answer, and understanding also there is no silver bullet to solve our energy needs. Jed Clampett will not go out there, shooting at some food, and up through the ground will come a bubbling crude.

We need conservation efforts. It is good. It should be encouraged, but that alone will not solve our problems. We need alternate energy sources. It is good. It should be encouraged. That alone will not solve our problems. We need oil exploration in this country. It is good. It should be encouraged. That alone will not solve our problems. But if we do not do the oil exploration, there is no hope of ever satisfying our problems. It has to be part of the equation.

There are some people who will also oversimplify the fact of saying you cannot have energy exploration and environmental protection. That is another attitude situation there because indeed you can have both. We have produced the technology to accomplish that. What used to take 60 acres to produce can now be done in 6 acres.

The simple fact is God has given us the resources to solve our problem. He has also given us the intellect to come up with the technology to solve our problem. Now what we must do is move forward in both areas to solve our problem, rather than sitting back and cursing the darkness.

When I first came here, there was a concerted effort to send e-mails to legislators, congressmen, in an effort to try and say not to do any kind of drilling up in this area set aside for that drilling purposes. I am perhaps different than my predecessor because I called those form e-mails back, and I just talked to many of them, realizing many of them had absolutely no clue about this area or what it was doing.

I remember specifically talking to a woman in Centerville, and in the course of the conversation saying that the people who live in this area and know it and who love this land are almost unanimously in favor of it, and her response was simply: Of course, they are. They do not know what is best for them.

It is that elitist, paternalistic attitude that has frustrated our efforts to solve this particular problem. It is now time for us to learn from our mistakes in the past and move forward and at long last do it with this particular legislation.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule. I urge adoption of the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend, for yielding me the time.

You know, it is not often that I find myself quoting the distinguished President Ronald Reagan, but this morning, I just cannot help myself. I feel like I

must say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, "well, there you go again."

It was just 1 week ago today that Mr. BISHOP and I were discussing the merits of drilling for oil and natural gas on the beaches of Florida or California and elsewhere. Thoughtfully, the House rejected that shortsighted and ill-conceived plan and left my Republican colleagues looking elsewhere on the map to score political points while doing absolutely nothing to help consumers or develop sound energy policy.

Of course, should ill-conceived ideas and shortsighted plans ever start selling for \$75 a barrel, I would like the drilling rights to the Republican party platform.

Madam Speaker, there are so many things wrong with this bill, it is almost like I do not know where to start. So much to criticize, so little time. For starters, let us take a look at how this bill might benefit our country, using the most wildly optimistic predictions of how much extractable oil there is in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Using the Bush administration's own estimates, which are probably inflated like some of the other Bush predictions we have heard over the past 5 years, there are 10.4 billion barrels of recoverable oil in ANWR. If this is accurate, then in 20 years, our reliance on foreign oil would be reduced from, get this, Madam Speaker, reduced from 60 percent to 57 percent and would likely result in gas prices being reduced by, again, using administration estimates, one penny per gallon. Well, on behalf of the American people, let me just say thank you for the relief at the pump in the year 2025.

Using less optimistic predictions, being more conservative if you will, there may be only 3.2 billion barrels of recoverable oil in ANWR or roughly 6 months of oil based on our current consumption. This is the silver bullet to our Nation's energy concerns?

Once again, like with the immigration issue, this administration and this Congress seem to only be moved to action when an issue becomes a political crisis. Both of these issues obviously have been a public policy crisis for years, but it is election year, isn't it? Some pay more attention to the needs of the American people when their jobs are on the line in 5 months from now.

You know what I find most interesting, Madam Speaker? It is the tepid support by energy companies for this proposal. Most of the major oil companies have recently pulled up stakes in Alaska. They have already come to the conclusion that this Congress will probably come to, I would think, in maybe 5 years and another 24 votes. It just does not make economic sense to drill in Alaska. BP, Amoco, Texaco and Chevron, among others, are examples of companies that are questioning their former commitment to drilling in the ANWR.

Here is one of my favorites, Madam Speaker, and I would advise my col-

leagues on the other side to pay attention because I am about to mention one of the most hallowed names from your point of view.

A former petroleum engineer from Halliburton, a company that heretofore has not seen a patch of land they did not want to exploit, said recently, "The enthusiasm of government officials about ANWR exceeds that of industry because oil companies are driven by market forces, investing resources in direct proportion to the economic potential, and the evidence so far about ANWR is not promising."

But you know, Madam Speaker, I am not as naive as some of my colleagues may think. I know this bill is not as much about Alaska as it is about Florida and California's outer continental shelf. I said it last week, and I will repeat it again today, this bill is simply trying to get the nose under the tent and using that approach.

It has been widely reported, without much argument, that opening up ANWR to oil drilling is simply a political ploy to opening the door to areas that allegedly have more promise, which brings us right back to where we were last week until our colleagues ADAM PUTNAM, LOIS CAPPS and JIM DAVIS helped to straighten things out.

Finally, Madam Speaker, to add insult to injury, the Rules Committee Republicans have shut out the American people from offering thoughtful alternatives to their risky scheme in the ANWR. Despite having no legislative business on the House floor tomorrow, none, no legislative business tomorrow, yes, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, Congress is taking another Friday off. Despite this fact, the leadership brings this bill to the floor under a closed rule. That means no duly elected Member of this body, Republican, Democrat or Independent, will have the opportunity to amend this bill. You heard me right. If any of 300 million Americans had a different idea about what to do about this bill, their elected representative in this House of Representatives is prohibited from offering an alternative, a change, a better plan. And we call this democracy?

Madam Speaker, for the reasons I have already articulated and for so many others that I am sure many of my colleagues will point out, we are prescribed by time constraints and, therefore, cannot discuss them all, but I urge any Member of this House who has any other idea about sound energy policy to oppose this closed rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would just in deference to the Rules Committee defending their actions note that there was only one amendment that was sent as a potential amendment to this rule, and that was nongermane. It is very difficult to put amendments in order that have never been submitted to the Rules Committee in the first place.

Madam Speaker, with that, maybe even to verify that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and thank him for his fine leadership on this issue.

As Mr. POMBO pointed out when he became before the Rules Committee, we are people now embarking on the 12th vote on this issue, and it is our hope that the other body will, in recognition of the strong broad public support for our exploration in ANWR, will now be able to see us proceed with that.

I was thinking about the technological advances that we have made in this country. We have instant messaging. We have this amazing story I saw the other day of a Boeing aircraft that, rather than using 1,500 sheets of aluminum, they now are using one tiny piece of carbon fiber instead. We are seeing surgery being performed by robots successfully, and there is this sense somehow that when it comes to exploration in ANWR that it is sort of as if, you know, people believe that it is like we would have a blindfolded doctor drawing blood from a patient, like we have not made any advances whatsoever in the area of technology when, in fact, the energy industry has been in the forefront of technological advances.

So what we are talking about here, Madam Speaker, is using 21st century technology, and as Mr. POMBO said yesterday in the Rules Committee, extraordinarily rigorous, extraordinarily rigorous environmental standards, higher than ever, to explore this tiny little area to see if we might be able to create an opportunity to bring gasoline prices down to the American consumer.

□ 1115

It is, to me, a no-brainer. It is a no-brainer because we are doing everything we can to pursue alternative sources of energy. We are doing everything we can to make sure that we conserve. We are taking all of these steps; now let's take this tiny little spot about the size of Dulles International Airport, let's take that tiny spot and explore and simply see if there might be the potential for us to move closer towards domestic energy self-sufficiency.

This is a very clear vote. It is the right vote for us to cast. We need to support this rule. As Mr. BISHOP said, there was one amendment that was filed, and people understand the issue since we have debated it time and time again.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying legislation so that we can move towards energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5429. In the Bible, in the Book of Genesis, Esau, believing he was about to die, sold his birthright to Jacob for a pot of red stew. The Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge is the birthright of the Gwich'in Tribe, who came to my office to indicate their opposition to this bill.

It is a national treasure of natural beauty and the natural habitat of the Porcupine Caribou. Are we, like Esau, about to sell our birthright for a mess of oily pottage? Are we ready to despoil our natural heritage in search of liquid fool's gold?

It is time for new thinking. Instead of oil companies taking over ANWR for drilling, we ought to be taking over the oil companies. They have gouged the American people at the pump. They control our politics. They have ignored the inconvenient truth of a growing global environmental crisis. After all, why are we having more hurricanes? We have to start thinking holistically and make the connections between cause and effect. We are not doing that when we talk about drilling here.

Oil companies work to defeat alternative energy. The lust for oil puts us on a path towards war. It is time for new energy policies, where we work for wind, solar, geothermal, and green hydrogen solutions. We should be enacting a windfall profits tax to address the gouging at the pump. We should be breaking up the oil monopolies and taking over the oil companies, if necessary.

We shouldn't be sacrificing ANWR. Esau thought his birthright didn't mean much. Will we, like Esau, come to regret that we never claimed our right to control our own natural resources, or our own environment, our own country?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for the purpose of talking about, once again, this area set aside by the Carter administration for future oil exploration, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for 2½ minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 5429 and the underlying rule. Energy and exploration and production in ANWR will take place under the most stringent environmental protection requirements ever applied. It will be limited to just 2,000 acres of ANWR's 1002 area, which equals one ten-thousandths of the ANWR area, the size of a mid-sized U.S. airport.

The average estimate of recoverable oil from 2,000 acres of ANWR is 10.4 billion barrels. That is more than double the proven reserves of Texas and could increase America's total proven reserves, which is 21 billion barrels, by nearly 50 percent. Energy development on ANWR's northern coastal plain could deliver an additional 1.5 million barrels of oil per day, nearly equal to the amount we import from Saudi Arabia on a daily basis.

Experts have estimated that safe energy exploration and production in

ANWR would create between 250,000 and 1 million new jobs in the United States. Energy exploration and production in ANWR's northern coastal plain would raise \$111 billion to \$173 billion in Federal royalties and tax revenues. And given our current tax situation, we think that would certainly be somewhat notable.

H.R. 5429 includes an export ban. All oil and natural gas produced on ANWR's northern coastal plain must stay in the United States. Safe energy exploration and production have continued for the last 3 decades in Prudhoe Bay, just 80 miles west of ANWR. The caribou herd at Prudhoe Bay has tripled since development began. This contradicts the argument that ANWR drilling will lead to the demise of the caribou herd there.

Lastly, at today's energy prices, just the mean estimate of ANWR's resources represents a \$728 billion economic decision. The Congress will either vote "yes" to invest \$728 billion in America's energy security, economic growth, and job creation; or vote "no" to send all of the above overseas.

We cannot afford to continue to do this. Our dependence on overseas oil is certainly the major cause of our trade deficit at the present time. So I urge support of H.R. 5429 and the underlying rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this rule, the attempt to open the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to industrial development.

We have just heard previous speakers on the other side of the aisle talk about safe development, high-tech, and how there is no risk in drilling in ANWR. Well, just this past March, we are reminded of the potential environmental consequences of drilling. In the Alaskan refuge area, we need to protect this pristine environment. Why? Just recently, an Alaskan pipeline leaked 200,000 gallons of crude oil, just this past March. This is the largest spill ever in the north slope, and it should be a timely caution to all of us against opening the Arctic refuge to drilling.

Because I have visited the Arctic refuge and seen its unique wilderness firsthand, such news as leaks in pipelines, dumping 200,000 gallons of crude oil onto the Alaskan soil, strengthens my resolve to protect this refuge and press for real solutions to our country's energy challenges. This rule would do nothing more than to continue our pattern of unchecked consumption. It is another attempt to sell Americans the false promise of easy answers to our energy policy.

With the booming economies of China and India squeezing the global oil supply, and the political instability among key oil producing countries

such as Iran, Nigeria, and Iraq, we should be expecting rising oil prices for some time to come. Our energy situation will not change until this Republican-led Congress gets serious about attacking America's oil dependency.

The proposal to open ANWR is a shortsighted answer to a long-term problem, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise today in full support of the underlying legislation and the rule. And I want to say, after listening to the last speaker, it reminds me that there are far too many lawyers in this body and not enough scientists, because oftentimes we hear emotion trumping science.

As the chairman of the Resources Committee Energy and Mineral Resource Subcommittee, I and the committee itself have been adamantly championing the use of renewable resources as well as increasing the production of our own abundant domestic resources.

For far too long, Madam Speaker, our Nation's energy supplies have been influenced by this false choice, a false choice between environmental protection and energy production. With the advancements in technology, we can strike a delicate balance between the two, not because it sounds politically right, but because it is the right policy.

For too long, development and production of our domestic energy has languished, driving investments overseas and increasing our reliance on foreign and often unstable energy resources. Yet we continue the cycle of tolerating irresponsible energy policies that discourage investment in domestic energy production. Relying on foreign and sometimes hostile nations for energy and minerals jeopardizes our national security and leaves American consumers at the mercy of the world energy markets.

For the safety and security of our homeland, I want the United States to be reasonably self-sufficient in meeting the demands of our current energy consumption. One important component of securing our future domestic energy supply is the environmentally responsible development of the 1002 lands in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge that was set aside specifically for oil exploration. This area was set aside in the mid 1960s when oil was less than \$5 a barrel, gasoline was less than 25 cents a gallon, because even at that time demand was increasing.

There was recognition then, Madam Speaker, that the need to increase supply was paramount. Today, we are nearing a critical mass in that need. Not only will we be competing with emerging economies like China and India for energy resources in the future, but our own domestic resources that are vital to securing our homeland

are left untapped as a result of demagoguery from those who refuse to address the realities of our current and future demand for energy resources.

It is disingenuous to say that ANWR will not provide a significant or important source of oil for our Nation. The USGS has estimated that the oil reserve in this area can replace the oil we get from Saudi Arabia for 30 years, 10.4 billion barrels, which would make the largest oil reserve find in the world since the nearby Prudhoe Bay discovery was done 30 years ago. We cannot wait another day to start securing our energy future.

The responsible development of this minuscule portion of ANWR that was always meant for oil exploration is a good start, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Before yielding to my distinguished friend, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a March 20th report in The New York Times, byline reading "North Slope Oil Spill Raises New Concerns Over Pipeline Maintenance;" and equally from yesterday's Wall Street Journal, the "EPA and the FBI Check Allegations of Improper Repair Work on Two Big Storage Tanks."

For all my colleagues that talk about all this environmental protection, I would like for them to read these two articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 2006]

NORTH SLOPE OIL SPILL RAISES NEW CONCERNS OVER PIPELINE MAINTENANCE
(By Felicity Barringer)

WASHINGTON, Mar. 18.—An oil spill this month in Alaska, the largest ever on the North Slope, has raised new concerns among state and federal regulators about whether BP has been properly maintaining its aging network of wells, pumps and pipelines that crisscross the tundra.

BP Exploration Alaska, the subsidiary of the international oil giant that operates the corroded transmission line from which more than 200,000 gallons of crude oil leaked, has been criticized and fined in several different cases, most recently in 2004 when state regulators fined the company more than \$1.2 million.

Now the division of the federal Department of Transportation responsible for pipeline safety is looking into the company's maintenance practices.

James Wiggins, a spokesman for the office, said Friday that BP had been informed that it could not restart the pipeline until the company had thoroughly inspected the line, internally and externally, repaired it, and given the agency a corrosion monitoring plan.

In addition, one of the company's longtime employees, a mechanic and local union official who has participated in the spill clean-up, said in a telephone interview that he and his colleagues had repeatedly warned their superiors that cutbacks in routine maintenance

and inspection had increased the chances of accidents or spills.

In the interview, Marc Kovac, who is an official of the United Steelworkers union, which represents workers at the BP facility, said he had seen little change in BP's approach despite the warnings.

"For years we've been warning the company about cutting back on maintenance," Mr. Kovac said, adding that he was speaking for himself, not the union. "We know that this could have been prevented."

Asked about Mr. Kovac's account, Daren Beardo, a company spokesman, said in an e-mail message, "Whenever employees raise concerns about our operations we look into them and address them." He did not specifically address Mr. Kovac's account of his complaints to his bosses.

In November 2004, the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission fined the company more than \$1.2 million after an explosion and fire at one of its wells. The accident, in 2002, left an operator badly burned.

BP has cultivated a worldwide image as a company concerned about the environment, recognizing global warming and making conspicuous efforts at aggressive environmental protection in many places.

But the most recent spill, which spurted from an elevated transmission pipeline at a spot where it dips to ground level to allow caribou to cross, has prompted critics inside the industry and among environmental groups to revisit questions raised four years ago. They question whether the company is skimping on maintenance and inspections to save money—a complaint the company strenuously denies.

But it remains unclear whether the company had warning that corrosion in this line had worsened to the point of a breach, and whether the warning signals company officials say they picked up in September should have prompted them to shut down this section of pipe and route oil around it.

"When we inspected the line in September 2005, points of manageable corrosion were evident and all were within standards of operations integrity," Mr. Beardo said in an e-mail message. "Something happened to the corrosion rates in that line between September 2005 and the time of the spill that we don't yet fully understand."

Gary Evans, an environmental program specialist with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, defended the company in a telephone interview. Referring to the September inspections with ultrasound imaging, he said, "I believe in my heart if they would have found a spot on that pipeline that set off a bell or a whistle they would have shut it off" and built the kind of detour pipeline now under construction.

"I can't believe for a second that they would chance it," he added. "This is a worst-case scenario."

Another question is whether the company postponed for too long a rigorous but disruptive internal inspection of the pipeline, known in industry jargon as smart pigging.

In the procedure, electronic monitors called smart pigs—successors to an earlier generation of cleaning devices that squealed as they ran through the pipe—are used to measure the thickness of a pipe's walls and detect defects. Mr. Beardo and Mr. Kovac agreed that since 1998 no such inspection had been performed on the line that leaked.

Setting up the device is cumbersome, and its data are hard to analyze. The process also slows the movement of oil to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

BP's own 2003 plan for safe maintenance and management of its facilities, on file with the Alaska Department of Environmental Protection, says that "the interval between smart-pig runs is typically five years."

Mr. Beaudou, the BP spokesman, said that since 1999, 85 external corrosion inspections had been conducted on that line. Further, he said, 139 internal inspections were performed with ultrasound devices, applied to the outside of the insulated pipe, providing a picture of the inside.

In a news conference on Tuesday, Maureen Johnson, the senior vice president and manager of the Greater Prudhoe Bay unit of BP Exploration Alaska, said, "We believe the leak was caused by internal corrosion and internal corrosion caused relatively, recently"—in the last six to nine months.

In September, she said, inspections revealed advancing corrosion and showed "we needed to do something." She said an internal "smart pig" inspection was scheduled for this month.

In an e-mail message to a company lawyer in June 2004, Mr. Kovac, the union official, assembled a collection of his earlier complaints to management. One of these, dated Feb. 28, 2003, concerned "corrosion monitoring staffing levels." It began, "The corrosion monitoring crew will soon be reduced to six staff down from eight."

Later, it noted, "With the present, staff, the crew is currently one month behind. The backlog is expected to increase with a further reduction in manpower."

Mr. Kovac and other workers have reported their concerns for several years to Chuck Hamel, a onetime oil broker who has made himself a conduit for getting press attention for worker complaints and whom Mr. Kovac called "our ombudsman."

Asked about Mr. Kovac's account, Mr. Hamel said: "Whatever I've been able to help the technicians publicize, they've fixed. Whatever we're not publicizing, we don't fix. They delay, and they schedule for next year. Everything's scheduled for next year. That way, if something goes, like in this case, they say, 'We scheduled that.'"

Mr. Beaudou, asked about staffing levels, said by e-mail, "We've significantly increased the number of external inspections since 2000," adding "and therefore have increased our staffing."

He pointed to the company's 2004 report to the state on corrosion monitoring. It shows that external and internal inspections on lines from the wellheads—usually smaller than the transmission lines like the one that leaked—rose from 39,001 in 2001 to 69,666 in 2002, before falling back slightly, to 60,666 in 2003 and 62,637 in 2004.

In a separate message he noted that staffing and scheduling decisions for the BP division that handles corrosion inspections "are carefully considered and managed according to the scope of the work being done."

In a news release Friday, Kurt Fredriksson, a commissioner of the state Department of Environmental Conservation, praised BP's efforts. "The oil spill response has been well managed," he said. "The spill occurred at a time when impacts to the environment are minimal."

The release also quoted him as saying, "We will be considering the investigation team's findings over the next several weeks in deciding whether to propose additional corrective actions or regulatory changes for leak detection, corrosion control and integrity management."

The line that leaked was in the last leg of a network that carries oil from the wellhead through processing facilities and on to the main pipeline that ends in Valdez.

The smaller lines nearer the wells are regulated by the state; lines like the 34-inch one that leaked are under the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of the federal Transportation Department.

But that office exempts from its regulations pipelines, like the one that leaked,

that are in rural areas and are run at low pressures. At a House subcommittee hearing on Thursday, Lois N. Epstein, a petroleum engineer and an environmental advocate in Alaska, called for the department to scrap that exemption.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 24, 2006]
U.S. PROBES ALASKA PIPELINE REPAIRS: EPA, FBI CHECK ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPER REPAIR WORK ON TWO BIG STORAGE TANKS

(By Jim Carlton)

Federal investigators are looking into allegations that workers contracted by oil companies that manage the Trans-Alaska Pipeline improperly repaired two giant storage tanks used by the pipeline, potentially putting the structures at risk, according to an agency charged with overseeing the 800-mile line.

Federal officials—including criminal investigators from the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation—are also looking into whether company and government officials in charge of overseeing the facility falsified records to make it appear the welding was done correctly, according to a former analyst for the consortium of oil companies that run the pipeline.

The inquiries come amid increased scrutiny of energy-infrastructure issues in Alaska and their consequences for both energy reliability and the environment. A separate informal criminal probe by the EPA began earlier this year over BP PLC's management of pipelines at the Prudhoe Bay field on Alaska's North Slope.

The pipeline is run by Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., a consortium that includes BP, Exxon Mobil Corp. and ConocoPhillips, and is overseen by the Joint Pipeline Office, a state-federal agency that also oversees the two tanks, which are near Valdez, Alaska.

Each tank can hold 500,000 barrels of oil. Critics say a breach could dump oil into nearby Prince William Sound and disrupt oil shipments to the continental U.S. Alyeska officials say the tanks sit behind dikes that would contain a spill.

An EPA spokesman declined to comment. FBI officials declined to confirm or deny an investigation was under way. JPO spokeswoman Rhea DoBosh said an employee of her agency was questioned by investigators of both federal agencies.

Ms. DoBosh added that her agency isn't aware of any wrongdoing and that it previously looked into complaints of faulty welds made during repair work on the tanks but failed to substantiate them. She also said she was unaware of an inquiry into alleged falsification of records.

Officials of Alyeska said they weren't aware of the federal inquiry and that they, too, had looked into the matter after complaints about the welds surfaced several years ago but found no problems.

The welding allegations originated with an employee of the joint-pipeline office, according to Glen Plumlee, who recently retired as a strategic planning coordinator at Alyeska. In an interview this week Mr. Plumlee said that shortly before he retired in April he was contacted by the employee about the allegations. Neither Mr. Plumlee nor the joint-pipeline office disclosed the identity of the employee.

Mr. Plumlee said that after retiring he notified the EPA and FBI about the allegations, which he said stemmed from welding done in 2001 and 2002.

Mr. Plumlee this month also sent a letter outlining the allegations to Charles Hamel, who has long served as a conduit for safety-related complaints by Alaskan oil-industry workers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good

friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLIVER).

Mr. OLIVER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we are engaged in a bait-and-switch exercise that Congress is exceptionally good at, but which is utterly shameful. We all know we have a problem, a broad problem. Ninety-eight percent of the fuel that is used by our vehicles, our autos and trucks for personal and commercial purposes, for highway and air travel operates on oil. The world has the same problem.

We have a now problem. Our gasoline prices are hovering at \$3 a gallon, and that causes a serious problem for a lot of our commerce and a lot of our families. Yet, if we accept the solution offered today by this bill to explore and develop for oil on the coastal plain of ANWR, it will be 5 years, at least, and probably closer to 8 before the first barrel of oil flows from that effort. By then, we will be having \$6 a gallon gasoline and only 1 to 2 years worth of the oil that we need every single year for our transportation.

The broad permanent solution, solar cars, hydrogen cars, electric cars, and total replacement of gasoline by ethanol cars, is most likely a generation away. But the real bait and switch is that we have the technology already available to increase the efficiency by 50 percent within the same 5 to 8 years that we would need to develop the first barrel of oil out of ANWR, which would save as much oil every single year that is provided for only 1 or 2 years by what we have had estimated as the ANWR capacity.

ANWR is a small part of Alaska. It is a small part of the north slope area of Alaska. Ninety percent, more than that, of the coastal plain of the north coast is already open to oil and gas exploration and development. The coastal plain within ANWR is an exceptionally concentrated productive habitat for caribou and migratory birds.

□ 1130

It provides calving for hundreds of thousands of caribou and nesting for a multitude of species of birds. The habitat also then becomes habitat for predator species.

It would be a tragedy to disrupt this very critical natural habitat by the utterly destructive action sanctioned by this bill which will not reduce by a single penny the gasoline prices which are our now problem. I hope we will not adopt either the rule or the legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am always sometimes amazed or reminded by our friends from the oil- or energy-consuming States that don't understand the size of those in the West.

It is true that ANWR is a small percentage of Alaska, but I would remind you that the wildlife refuge of ANWR is still the size of South Carolina. The 1002 land we are talking about, which is not ANWR, which was set aside for exploration, is the size of Delaware; and that is still significant in that process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. This important legislation will reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy, moderate gas prices for consumers and create high-paying jobs. This legislation will do all of that while also reducing our trade and budget deficits.

Opening up ANWR, according to the mean estimate, would make available 10.4 billion barrels of oil for domestic consumption. That is more than the proven reserves in all of Texas. The resulting economic activity will create as many as 250,000 new jobs. As an additional benefit, royalties and corporate taxes in the amount of \$111 billion would flow to the Federal Government over 30 years, a modest but real improvement in our Nation's budget picture.

Madam Speaker, opponents of this legislation are going to make two different arguments. They are going to say that passage of this legislation will not address all of our energy problems, and they are going to voice environmental concerns. I want to briefly say a word about each of these points.

On the first argument, it is true: Opening ANWR will not solve all of our Nation's energy problems. But in point of fact, there is no single solution for all of our energy problems. We should no more reject ANWR because it fails to solve all of our energy problems than we should reject investing in promising sources of energy that may be many years away from fruition.

Likewise, we should not reject efforts at conservation just because this too can only solve part of the problem instead of all of it. Simply put, we cannot afford to reject any measure that helps us reach the goal of energy independence.

Madam Speaker, on the second concern regarding the environment, much has been said. My own view is this: With this legislation, we are faced with the choice of whether we have more of our energy production done overseas or whether to have more of it done in the United States. This choice has real environmental consequences. We can have more oil production occur here where it is done under the most stringent environmental regulations in the world, using the most sophisticated technology, or we can have more oil production done overseas where, in many cases, far weaker environmental regulations prevail.

True environmentalists think globally, not nationally. On this basis, we should produce as much energy as possible in the well-regulated confines of our own country.

I would urge Members to support this important legislation that would pro-

vide our Nation with a secure new source of domestic energy for many years to come.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Here we are Memorial Day weekend. In addition to taking time to reflect on those who have made our country safe and made sacrifices, it is the beginning of the traditional summer driving season.

Families across America are going to pay \$50 to fill up, or more, and they are mad. So here we are for the 13th time in the United States House of Representatives voting to put politics and symbolism over geology and reality.

Now, even if the wildly optimistic estimates of government bureaucrats, not the industry, about the reserves which the Republicans keep quoting with certainty, and they are far from certain; even if that was all there, this would provide a decade from today about 5 cents relief at the pump.

But if they were willing to take on Big Oil, we could deliver 70 cents tomorrow at the pump. 75 percent of the oil is traded in a speculative way. There is no market. There is no free market in oil. If we regulated oil the same as other commodities, estimates are we could save 70 cents tomorrow per gallon. If we broke up the collusion among the oil companies who have colluded to close refineries to drive up the price—refinery profits are up 255 percent in one year—then we could save Americans another 35 cents at the pump.

So with a couple of actions here on the floor, we could save people a buck a gallon. They are saying, 10 years from today, maybe under wild estimates we might save you a nickel.

But they are not going to take on Big Oil because Big Oil is very generous at campaign time, and this is all about the elections. They want to pretend that they are doing something meaningful.

Now they want to say it is environmentally sound. How do we get to that conclusion? It is deemed. Does anyone know what "deeming" means? Congress ignores reality and says we are creating a new reality. The reality is I came to Congress in 1987. We held weeks of hearings on this so-called environmental analysis. It was laughable at the time when produced by Mr. Watt and the Reagan administration. It was rejected by the courts. This was rejected 20 years ago. They are deeming it sufficient today. They are talking about the most modern technology and analysis and highest environmental protections. Yes, those of James Watt and Ronald Reagan rejected by the courts as insufficient 20 years ago so they can jam through a symbolic bill before Memorial Day weekend to pretend like they really care about American families.

They care about the CEOs of those companies. The head of ExxonMobil, a

\$400 million retirement. Those are the people they care about. They don't care about the families who are having to curtail their vacations because they can't afford 50 bucks to fill up.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I am dismayed to see the issue of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge come to the floor again, especially under a rule that is narrowly limited. It limits our debate on what is such a volatile issue, and it has the power to turn our Nation far off track in our road to increasing the use of alternative fuels.

Drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the easy way out. Heading off to one of our last bastions of wildlands to fuel what the President has called an "addiction to oil" is shameful. This Congress can do better. This Congress can be creative.

As a Californian, I am proud of my State. When we have a problem, we think, we research it, we dedicate the resources. We create and we solve our problems. In a year, when the public is laughing at this Congress for the few days that we are working here, we have a chance to prove to America that we will take on the issue of energy dependence by investing in wind and solar, biomass, hydrogen, efficient energy programs that will create U.S. jobs.

Instead of debating these real issues, we are wasting our time once again on this narrow focus of drilling in what is our one pristine national wildland that really deserves saving, not to scour it for oil that will do little to help America's goal of energy independence.

I hope that this Congress will vote against this rule and vote against drilling in ANWR.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

I thought it was appropriate for our friends from the Rules Committee to talk about Jed Clampett shooting his gun and drilling up oil that way because, truly, this is sort of a Beverly Hillbillies approach to energy policy. It is a comedy of errors, and my Republican friends are shooting themselves in the foot.

Their approach to solve our problem, putting as central oil exploration in the United States, produces no hope of satisfying our long-term energy problem. They focus on giving billions of dollars to oil companies for breaks that industry does not need. They are missing in action on serious conservation,

fuel efficiency and work on alternative energy.

But one of the silliest arguments I have heard is that in an area the size of Delaware, we are "only" talking about 2,000 acres. We are "only" talking, as my friend from California mentioned, about the size of the Dulles Airport.

That is like saying the Augusta National Golf Course which has 18 golf holes, 4¼ inches in diameter, is only really have a golf footprint of less than 2 square feet.

Well, it is not just the hole that you are drilling, just like it is not the hole at the golf course. You have got golf cart paths, clubhouses, thousands of people who use it, irrigation, tool sheds, tee boxes.

My friend from Wisconsin could talk about all of the impacts of a golf course. If you are going to open this up to active oil exploration, you are going to have roads and ancillary activities that are going to produce a vast network, a wildly much greater footprint that is going to have serious economic and environmental consequences.

Madam Speaker, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, even if you think it should be drilled, is absolutely the last place we should be looking for oil, not the next place.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I don't want to try and change any kind of factual data, especially from my good friends from the Pacific Northwest, but actually this is the 12th, not the 13th time we have voted on this issue.

And, unfortunately, the Dulles Airport is actually five times bigger than the area we are talking about drilling. That is 11,000 acres. This is only 2,000 acres.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman also from the Pacific Northwest from the State of Washington (Miss MCMORRIS).

Miss MCMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 5429. America deserves and needs American energy, and this legislation is an important step in achieving that.

The American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act would open, as we have heard, just 2,000 acres of nearly 20 million acres. If it were a football field, it would be equivalent to the size of a postage stamp. If it were the front page of the New York Times, it would be equivalent to the size of a lower case letter "a." This leaves 99 percent of the land in its natural condition.

However, these 2,000 acres would recover 10.4 billion barrels, more than double the proven reserves of Texas, increasing America's total proven reserves by almost 50 percent.

This legislation is even more important in lessening our dependence on foreign oil and establishing a safe domestic supply that will entirely go to Americans. No longer should we rely on oil from countries that are not necessarily friendly or democratic. In fact, ANWR has the possibility of delivering

an amount of oil equal to the amount we import from Saudi Arabia. A strong domestic energy supply, both oil and renewable, is vital to our economic and national security.

Right now, we face the challenge of high oil demand. To meet that demand, we need to establish a supply to meet it. Energy is important to Americans. Fifty years ago, America was an exporter of oil. A lot has changed, and today, we import over 60 percent of our oil. Yet since the 1950s, little has been done to prepare for our country's current or future energy needs.

When it comes to energy, we need a U.S.-based system that relies on its own ingenuity and innovation. Just as we brought the best minds and innovative companies together to put a man on the moon, we need a national organized effort to explore ANWR in an environmentally safe manner. Twenty-first century technology and advanced engineering now exists that allow us to explore for oil and natural gas with minimal impact on the surrounding environment.

Our energy policy must include a broad mix of options: From clean coal and natural gas to nuclear energy and hydroelectric power, to wind power and solar power to biodiesel. Drilling in ANWR is just one component of this comprehensive strategy.

□ 1145

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, we will hear a lot of discussion today about how drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for our oil needs is nothing but an illusion, a fraud being perpetrated on the American people, because it is not going to be an answer either in the short term or the long term in regards to the energy challenge that we face. I believe that.

Why drilling in one of the most pristine, untouched areas of the world is something up for consideration in the House for the 12th time is beyond me.

But I also want to raise a very important issue, because there are a lot of gimmicks being played with the budget on this issue. At the very least, you think we would be honest and truthful and decent with the American taxpayer in regard to the hopeful revenues that this will generate.

In this legislation, it calls for a 50/50 split with the State of Alaska on royalties, but we all know this is not going to happen. The State legislature in Alaska last year passed a resolution saying, no, it will only agree to a 90/10 split. If we don't get it, we are suing you. Given the States' rights make-up in the court, they will in all likelihood prevail. Tens of billions of dollars are on the table over this important difference.

Even our friend and colleague in Alaska has publicly made it known his intent to fight this 50/50 split that is

contained in this legislation. Yet they will roll out the statistics on the budget revenue enhancers with royalties that we are going to be collecting by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge when they know it is false.

So at the very least, we should at least pin down the State of Alaska and our colleague from Alaska into whether they are going to accept the 50/50 split or whether they will tie this up in courts and probably have the courts rule against us under the Alaska Statehood Act. That is something that should be clarified before the ink is dry on this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

Madam Speaker, I could stand up here and talk about a lot of facts and figures that are astounding, I think, and will help the United States of America. But the bottom line is, we need to be more dependent on ourselves and not somebody else.

National security and national interest begin right here at home. Granted, some day I think we will solve this energy crisis. We will have a wonderful solution, but right now, we need to be more self-reliant and independent.

Keeping this country both safe and strong is a pledge that I made and a pledge that I will keep. I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation to keep our Nation safe.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and to H.R. 5429. This is legislation that would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration. I find it unbelievable that such a bad and ineffective bill could be given such a good name.

Opening up ANWR to drilling is not the answer to America's energy problem. It certainly will not create the jobs needed to help my hometown of Manassa, Colorado. What opening up ANWR will do is destroy one of the most pristine environments on our entire continent. Nobody really knows for sure how much oil there is in ANWR. Unfortunately, it would require a significant amount of drilling and testing to find this out.

Once they start exploration, they will already have destroyed part of the environment, an environment where I understand that no plant or animal species has gone extinct or that no outside species has invaded. It is pristine. In our global society, it has become apparent that we need to leave some areas untouched. ANWR is one of those areas.

I realize that our country has a fundamental imbalance between supply

and demand. Drilling in ANWR will provide little, if any, relief on demand. We cannot drill our way out of these problems.

Likewise, we cannot conserve our way out of the energy problems. We must diversify our portfolio.

On my farm, I do not grow just one crop. I must diversify my farming operation to be able to handle the ups and downs of the agricultural markets, and that is exactly what we need to do in this country.

By diversifying our energy portfolio, the country can better handle the volatility of energy markets. We need to invest in alternative energy resources, conservation and responsible domestic energy development. We have just a few unspoiled lands remaining in our country. We need to protect them.

Drilling in ANWR is not a form of responsible domestic energy development. I ask my colleagues to help protect ANWR. There is no better way in our country to reach energy independence than granting access to ANWR. This is a poor bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 835, the rule for H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. This legislation introduced by our own Chairman POMBO will provide for the responsible development of our domestic resources located on a very small portion of the nearly 20 million acre Alaskan National Wildlife Reserve. The size of the surface area that is proposed to be utilized is 2,000 acres.

To put that in perspective, when I fly out of Denver, Colorado from the airport there, DIA is situated on 34,000 acres. When the 20 million acre wildlife refuge was created by President Carter, a 1.5 million acre northern section was set aside for future energy exploration and development. Utilizing 2,000 acres is not an unreasonable amount to safely produce nearly 5 percent of our Nation's daily oil needs.

The people of Colorado are reasonable. They understand the need to find and produce domestic energy resources in a safe and sound manner. The small portion of ANWR that is proposed to be developed will produce approximately 1.5 million barrels of oil per day every day for 30 years. The level of production could replace imports from Saudi Arabia again for nearly 30 years. Relying on hostile governments for the fuel that runs our economy is dangerous, and it compromises our national security.

In order to meet our current and future energy demands, we must responsibly develop our abundant domestic resources in ANWR. I urge all of the Members to support House Resolution 835.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

MR. HERGER. Madam Speaker, my constituents in northern California are paying some of the highest gas prices in America. While prices continue to rise, ironically, the single-most promising untapped source of American oil in gas, ironically, remains off-limits to production.

This restriction does nothing to protect the environment. It simply ensures that Americans will continue to rely on foreign sources of oil. None of these foreign countries share our commitment to the environment, and many even have ties to terrorists. Madam Speaker, America has the most stringent environmental laws in the world, and we have the most advanced technology ever invented. This legislation combines our commitment to the environment with state-of-the-art technology to produce a commonsense plan for a secure energy future.

I urge support of the rule and for H.R. 5429.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have listened to this debate rather repeatedly over the years, and I still am trying to determine how it is that my colleagues on the other side persist in having politics triumph over geology.

I know of no substantial study that demonstrates that there would be a sufficient amount of oil that would cause substantial price decreases in gas at the pump. Given its wildest potential, even the most optimistic, it would be well into the future, probably as late as 2012 before a single drop of oil would go into a refinery and then a gas tank.

There is so much to be said for the fact that this Arctic reserve, in its pristine form, is among the last natural habitats that the United States has preserved. Unfortunately, in my State, every day that I pass on a road, I see more and more ecosystem destroyed so that we can build more and cause substantial damage to the environment.

Those of us who speak of environmental degradation do so with great passion, recognizing the significant need that we have as a country to produce alternative energy sources and to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. That is a real concern that I believe my colleagues and the majority and those of us in the minority share.

How you get there is not through a ruse, in the final analysis, and that is what ANWR is, because no one has been able, with the exception of one drilling action that took place in 1998 that has been a closely held secret, no one has been able to really tell any of us how much oil is there.

Given the best amount, it would be 10 billion barrels, which doesn't come close to what the problem is, and that is of the significant amount of coastal

oil that exists off the shore of California and Florida in the gulf, and that is over 70 billion barrels by scientific estimate.

So, basically, what my colleagues want to do and what the administration wants to do is stick its nose under the tent and drill in a pristine area and then lift the moratoria that exists in California and Florida for offshore drilling.

I don't know how long many of us have been in Congress or will be here, but I don't believe that it is wise policy for us to damage our environment for political gain and to do so in a political season, when, in fact, we know that what we do, even if this were to pass, and I call on my colleagues to defeat this rule, even if it were to pass, we know full well that it will not provide what is needed for us all.

I might add that the administration seems to be going in a different direction than many of the oil companies. Significant numbers of them, ConocoPhillips, for example, has stopped its financial support of Arctic power; Chevron, Texaco, BP, long active in Alaska, moved their executives to Houston from Alaska for the reason that they no longer feel that they are going to be able to produce the kinds of results that had been predicted. ExxonMobil has shown little public enthusiasm for the refuge.

I don't know if this enthusiasm that is coming from the other side is motivated by reality, but I do know this: It has a lot to do with politics and very little to do with geological realities. Let us defeat this rule and defeat this substantive measure for the 12th time and be prepared to do so the 13th, because I am sure my colleagues will bring it back.

□ 1200

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would like to make just a couple of points in closing. One of the issues that was brought up at the last moment was on a potential court challenge based on a potential 90-10 demand by the State of Alaska rather than 50-50 in the bill. Such an issue is a question. However, on a separate piece of legislation in a separate court system, the Federal court has rejected the 90-10 argument, so even if there is anything, 50-50 will be the reality of it. That is the precedent that has already been established.

The gentleman from Colorado, who was speaking towards the end, talked about the need to diversify, diversify on his agricultural endeavors, diversify on what we are doing with our energy needs, and I agree totally.

As I said earlier, it is important, it is sufficient that there is not one sole silver bullet to solve our energy needs. We need conservation programs. We need alternative energy programs. We also need to drill the oil that is available in the United States to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. It is true that we cannot solve our energy problems if we do not do that other leg of the situation.

It is important that we can do this also in an environmentally sensitive way. Once again, don't take my word for it, but once again the Energy Department, during the Clinton administration, in their Report on Environmental Benefits of Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Technology, established an entire chapter to the fact that our technology has advanced to the time where we can do this production and maintain environmental sensitivity at the same time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. No, let me just finish. I apologize. Let me finish, if I may.

That was in 1999. In the year 2000, once again, the Argonne National Laboratory study dealing with an area just 80 miles from the proposed drilling site, once again, concluded there were no impacts on any wildlife species that have ever been documented in that particular area.

We are not dealing with the wildlife refuge, the so-called pristine area. That has already been set aside, as well as 100 million acres of other pristine area within Alaska and the Lower 48. But this ANWR, the wilderness refuge, is still the size of the State of South Carolina, which will not be impacted.

What we are talking about is potential drilling in the 1002 lands, the size of the State of Delaware, that was set aside by the minority party when they were in power back in the 1980s as an area for future exploration. That was its purpose. That was its goal.

We are asking that simply to fulfill the purpose of this particular land and do it in the proper way, and do it in a way that will be smaller than Dulles. Actually it is more like the size of Reagan Airport, which is far less encompassing than the Dulles Airport.

We can do this. We need to do this. We need to move this country forward.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 5429 pursuant to House Resolution 835, the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on a motion to recommit as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, Madam Speaker, but I do want to point out to my colleague, in light of the fact that he did not yield to me and that is why I reserve the right to object, that the 90-10 royalty reality was in the form of an amendment that my colleagues chose not to make in order so that we could settle that issue. You point to it rightly as a very significant issue, and the 50-50 split would enhance the opportunities of the American public.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Finishing my time here, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the parliamentary procedures that my good friend from Florida knows and does extremely well here. It is true, that was part of the amendment deemed nongermane to the issue at hand. And, once again, I think the precedent is there that that problem is solved and is a moot issue.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would urge our support of this rule, I would urge our support for the 12th and final time of passing this needed piece of legislation as a significant part of our energy independence in this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—234

Aderholt	Culberson	Hefley
Akin	Davis (KY)	Henriling
Alexander	Davis, Jo Ann	Herger
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Baker	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Barrett (SC)	Dent	Hostettler
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Bass	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Beauprez	Drake	Issa
Biggert	Dreier	Istook
Bilirakis	Duncan	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Jindal
Blackburn	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Blunt	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Boehlert	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Feeney	Jones (NC)
Bonilla	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Bonner	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Keller
Bono	Foley	Kelly
Boozman	Forbes	Kennedy (MN)
Boren	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Boustany	Fossella	King (NY)
Bradley (NH)	Fox	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Ginny	Gallegly	Knollenberg
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Kuhl (NY)
Buyer	Gibbons	LaHood
Calvert	Gilchrest	Latham
Camp (MI)	Gillmor	LaTourette
Campbell (CA)	Greene	Leach
Cannon	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Goodlatte	Linder
Carter	Granger	LoBiondo
Castle	Graves	Lucas
Chabot	Green (WI)	Lungren, Daniel
Chocola	Green, Gene	E.
Coble	Gutknecht	Mack
Cole (OK)	Hall	Manzullo
Conaway	Harris	Marchant
Cramer	Hart	McCaul (TX)
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Cubin	Hayes	McCrery
Cuellar	Hayworth	McHenry

McHugh	Pombo	Simmons
McKeon	Porter	Simpson
McMorris	Price (GA)	Skelton
Melancon	Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Mica	Putnam	Smith (TX)
Miller (FL)	Radanovich	Sodrel
Miller (MI)	Ramstad	Souder
Miller, Gary	Regula	Stearns
Moran (KS)	Rehberg	Sullivan
Murphy	Reichert	Sweeney
Murtha	Renzi	Tancredo
Musgrave	Reyes	Taylor (NC)
Myrick	Reynolds	Terry
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)	Thomas
Ney	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Northup	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Norwood	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Nussle	Royce	Upton
Ortiz	Ryan (WI)	Walden (OR)
Osborne	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Otter	Saxton	Wamp
Oxley	Schmidt	Weldon (FL)
Paul	Schwarz (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Pence	Sessions	Whitfield
Peterson (PA)	Shadeeg	Wicker
Petri	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pickering	Shays	Wolf
Pitts	Sherwood	Young (AK)
Platts	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Poe	Shuster	

NAYS—184

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Obey
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Olver
Allen	Harman	Owens
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baca	Herse	Pascarell
Baird	Higgins	Pastor
Baldwin	Hinchey	Payne
Barrow	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bean	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Holt	Pomeroy
Berkley	Honda	Price (NC)
Berry	Hooley	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Ross
Blumenauer	Israel	Rothman
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Boyd	(TX)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Butterfield	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Capps	Kildee	T.
Capuano	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardin	Kind	Sanders
Cardoza	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Langevin	Schiff
Carson	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)
Case	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Lee	Serrano
Cleaver	Levin	Sherman
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Loftgren, Zoe	Solis
Costello	Lowe	Spratt
Crowley	Lynch	Stark
Cummings	Maloney	Strickland
Davis (AL)	Markey	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Tanner
Davis (FL)	Matheson	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Davis (TN)	McCarthy	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McDermott	Tierney
Delahunt	McGovern	Towns
DeLauro	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Dicks	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Dingell	McNulty	Van Hollen
Doggett	Meehan	Velázquez
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Emanuel	Michaud	Schultz
Engel	Millender-	Waters
Eshoo	McDonald	Watson
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Watt
Farr	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Filner	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Ford	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wu
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Green, Al	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—14

Berman	Flake	Mollohan
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)	Snyder
Costa	Hyde	Westmoreland
DeLay	Kennedy (RI)	Wilson (SC)
Evans	Miller, George	

□ 1230

Ms. BEAN changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REYES and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 835, I call up the bill (H.R. 5429) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5429

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COASTAL PLAIN.—The term "Coastal Plain" means that area described in appendix I to part 37 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary", except as otherwise provided, means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee.

SEC. 3. LEASING PROGRAM FOR LANDS WITHIN THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary—

(1) to establish and implement, in accordance with this Act and acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain; and

(2) to administer the provisions of this Act through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment, including, in furtherance of this goal, by requiring the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production to all exploration, development, and production operations under this Act in a manner that ensures the receipt of fair market value by the public for the mineral resources to be leased.

(b) REPEAL.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 3143) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1003.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—

(1) COMPATIBILITY.—For purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the oil and gas leasing program and activities authorized by this section in the Coastal Plain are deemed to be compatible with the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established, and no further findings or decisions are required to implement this determination.

(2) ADEQUACY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The "Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement" (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain prepared pursuant to section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 3142) and section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is deemed to satisfy the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 that apply with respect to prelease activities, including actions authorized to be taken by the Secretary to develop and promulgate the regulations for the establishment of a leasing program authorized by this Act before the conduct of the first lease sale.

(3) COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA FOR OTHER ACTIONS.—Before conducting the first lease sale under this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to the actions authorized by this Act that are not referred to in paragraph (2). Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is not required to identify non-leasing alternative courses of action or to analyze the environmental effects of such courses of action. The Secretary shall only identify a preferred action for such leasing and a single leasing alternative, and analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for those two alternatives. The identification of the preferred action and related analysis for the first lease sale under this Act shall be completed within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall only consider public comments that specifically address the Secretary's preferred action and that are filed within 20 days after publication of an environmental analysis. Notwithstanding any other law, compliance with this paragraph is deemed to satisfy all requirements for the analysis and consideration of the environmental effects of proposed leasing under this Act.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be considered to expand or limit State and local regulatory authority.

(e) SPECIAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after consultation with the State of Alaska, the city of Kaktovik, and the North Slope Borough, may designate up to a total of 45,000 acres of the Coastal Plain as a Special Area if the Secretary determines that the Special Area is of such unique character and interest so as to require special management and regulatory protection. The Secretary shall designate as such a Special Area the Sadlerochit Spring area, comprising approximately 4,000 acres.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Each such Special Area shall be managed so as to protect and preserve the area's unique and diverse character including its fish, wildlife, and subsistence resource values.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM LEASING OR SURFACE OCCUPANCY.—The Secretary may exclude any Special Area from leasing. If the Secretary

leases a Special Area, or any part thereof, for purposes of oil and gas exploration, development, production, and related activities, there shall be no surface occupancy of the lands comprising the Special Area.

(4) DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may lease all or a portion of a Special Area under terms that permit the use of horizontal drilling technology from sites on leases located outside the Special Area.

(f) LIMITATION ON CLOSED AREAS.—The Secretary's sole authority to close lands within the Coastal Plain to oil and gas leasing and to exploration, development, and production is that set forth in this Act.

(g) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act, including rules and regulations relating to protection of the fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and environment of the Coastal Plain, by no later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REVISION OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall periodically review and, if appropriate, revise the rules and regulations issued under subsection (a) to reflect any significant biological, environmental, or engineering data that come to the Secretary's attention.

SEC. 4. LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Lands may be leased pursuant to this Act to any person qualified to obtain a lease for deposits of oil and gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(b) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish procedures for—

(1) receipt and consideration of sealed nominations for any area in the Coastal Plain for inclusion in, or exclusion (as provided in subsection (c)) from, a lease sale;

(2) the holding of lease sales after such nomination process; and

(3) public notice of and comment on designation of areas to be included in, or excluded from, a lease sale.

(c) LEASE SALE BIDS.—Bidding for leases under this Act shall be by sealed competitive cash bonus bids.

(d) ACREAGE MINIMUM IN FIRST SALE.—In the first lease sale under this Act, the Secretary shall offer for lease those tracts the Secretary considers to have the greatest potential for the discovery of hydrocarbons, taking into consideration nominations received pursuant to subsection (b)(1), but in no case less than 200,000 acres.

(e) TIMING OF LEASE SALES.—The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct the first lease sale under this Act within 22 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) conduct additional sales so long as sufficient interest in development exists to warrant, in the Secretary's judgment, the conduct of such sales.

SEC. 5. GRANT OF LEASES BY THE SECRETARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder in a lease sale conducted pursuant to section 4 any lands to be leased on the Coastal Plain upon payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary.

(b) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—No lease issued under this Act may be sold, exchanged, assigned, sublet, or otherwise transferred except with the approval of the Secretary. Prior to any such approval the Secretary shall consult with, and give due consideration to the views of, the Attorney General.

SEC. 6. LEASE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An oil or gas lease issued pursuant to this Act shall—

(1) provide for the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease, as determined by the Secretary under the regulations applicable to other Federal oil and gas leases;

(2) provide that the Secretary may close, on a seasonal basis, portions of the Coastal Plain to exploratory drilling activities as necessary to protect caribou calving areas and other species of fish and wildlife;

(3) require that the lessee of lands within the Coastal Plain shall be fully responsible and liable for the reclamation of lands within the Coastal Plain and any other Federal lands that are adversely affected in connection with exploration, development, production, or transportation activities conducted under the lease and within the Coastal Plain by the lessee or by any of the subcontractors or agents of the lessee;

(4) provide that the lessee may not delegate or convey, by contract or otherwise, the reclamation responsibility and liability to another person without the express written approval of the Secretary;

(5) provide that the standard of reclamation for lands required to be reclaimed under this Act shall be, as nearly as practicable, a condition capable of supporting the uses which the lands were capable of supporting prior to any exploration, development, or production activities, or upon application by the lessee, to a higher or better use as approved by the Secretary;

(6) contain terms and conditions relating to protection of fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment as required pursuant to section 3(a)(2);

(7) provide that the lessee, its agents, and its contractors use best efforts to provide a fair share, as determined by the level of obligation previously agreed to in the 1974 agreement implementing section 29 of the Federal Agreement and Grant of Right of Way for the Operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, of employment and contracting for Alaska Natives and Alaska Native Corporations from throughout the State;

(8) prohibit the export of oil produced under the lease; and

(9) contain such other provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued under this Act.

(b) **PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary, as a term and condition of each lease under this Act and in recognizing the Government's proprietary interest in labor stability and in the ability of construction labor and management to meet the particular needs and conditions of projects to be developed under the leases issued pursuant to this Act and the special concerns of the parties to such leases, shall require that the lessee and its agents and contractors negotiate to obtain a project labor agreement for the employment of laborers and mechanics on production, maintenance, and construction under the lease.

SEC. 7. COASTAL PLAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

(a) **NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT STANDARD TO GOVERN AUTHORIZED COASTAL PLAIN ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary shall, consistent with the requirements of section 3, administer the provisions of this Act through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that—

(1) ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment;

(2) require the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and produc-

tion on all new exploration, development, and production operations; and

(3) ensure that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support of pipelines, does not exceed 2,000 acres on the Coastal Plain.

(b) **SITE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION.**—The Secretary shall also require, with respect to any proposed drilling and related activities, that—

(1) a site-specific analysis be made of the probable effects, if any, that the drilling or related activities will have on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment;

(2) a plan be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate (in that order and to the extent practicable) any significant adverse effect identified under paragraph (1); and

(3) the development of the plan shall occur after consultation with the agency or agencies having jurisdiction over matters mitigated by the plan.

(c) **REGULATIONS TO PROTECT COASTAL PLAIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES, SUBSISTENCE USERS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**—Before implementing the leasing program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and promulgate regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other measures designed to ensure that the activities undertaken on the Coastal Plain under this Act are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes and environmental requirements of this Act.

(d) **COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—The proposed regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations for the leasing program under this Act shall require compliance with all applicable provisions of Federal and State environmental law, and shall also require the following:

(1) Standards at least as effective as the safety and environmental mitigation measures set forth in items 1 through 29 at pages 167 through 169 of the "Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement" (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain.

(2) Seasonal limitations on exploration, development, and related activities, where necessary, to avoid significant adverse effects during periods of concentrated fish and wildlife breeding, denning, nesting, spawning, and migration.

(3) That exploration activities, except for surface geological studies, be limited to the period between approximately November 1 and May 1 each year and that exploration activities shall be supported, if necessary, by ice roads, winter trails with adequate snow cover, ice pads, ice airstrips, and air transport methods, except that such exploration activities may occur at other times if the Secretary finds that such exploration will have no significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain.

(4) Design safety and construction standards for all pipelines and any access and service roads, that—

(A) minimize, to the maximum extent possible, adverse effects upon the passage of migratory species such as caribou; and

(B) minimize adverse effects upon the flow of surface water by requiring the use of culverts, bridges, and other structural devices.

(5) Prohibitions on general public access and use on all pipeline access and service roads.

(6) Stringent reclamation and rehabilitation requirements, consistent with the standards set forth in this Act, requiring the removal from the Coastal Plain of all oil and gas development and production facilities,

structures, and equipment upon completion of oil and gas production operations, except that the Secretary may exempt from the requirements of this paragraph those facilities, structures, or equipment that the Secretary determines would assist in the management of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and that are donated to the United States for that purpose.

(7) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on access by all modes of transportation.

(8) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on sand and gravel extraction.

(9) Consolidation of facility siting.

(10) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on use of explosives.

(11) Avoidance, to the extent practicable, of springs, streams, and river system; the protection of natural surface drainage patterns, wetlands, and riparian habitats; and the regulation of methods or techniques for developing or transporting adequate supplies of water for exploratory drilling.

(12) Avoidance or minimization of air traffic-related disturbance to fish and wildlife.

(13) Treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic wastes, solid wastes, reserve pit fluids, drilling muds and cuttings, and domestic wastewater, including an annual waste management report, a hazardous materials tracking system, and a prohibition on chlorinated solvents, in accordance with applicable Federal and State environmental law.

(14) Fuel storage and oil spill contingency planning.

(15) Research, monitoring, and reporting requirements.

(16) Field crew environmental briefings.

(17) Avoidance of significant adverse effects upon subsistence hunting, fishing, and trapping by subsistence users.

(18) Compliance with applicable air and water quality standards.

(19) Appropriate seasonal and safety zone designations around well sites, within which subsistence hunting and trapping shall be limited.

(20) Reasonable stipulations for protection of cultural and archeological resources.

(21) All other protective environmental stipulations, restrictions, terms, and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(e) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In preparing and promulgating regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(1) The stipulations and conditions that govern the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska leasing program, as set forth in the 1999 Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Final Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

(2) The environmental protection standards that governed the initial Coastal Plain seismic exploration program under parts 37.31 to 37.33 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) The land use stipulations for exploratory drilling on the KIC-ASRC private lands that are set forth in Appendix 2 of the August 9, 1983, agreement between Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States.

(f) **FACILITY CONSOLIDATION PLANNING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, after providing for public notice and comment, prepare and update periodically a plan to govern, guide, and direct the siting and construction of facilities for the exploration, development, production, and transportation of Coastal Plain oil and gas resources.

(2) **OBJECTIVES.**—The plan shall have the following objectives:

(A) Avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities and activities.

(B) Encouraging consolidation of common facilities and activities.

(C) Locating or confining facilities and activities to areas that will minimize impact on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment.

(D) Utilizing existing facilities wherever practicable.

(E) Enhancing compatibility between wildlife values and development activities.

(g) ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) manage public lands in the Coastal Plain subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 811 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3121); and

(2) ensure that local residents shall have reasonable access to public lands in the Coastal Plain for traditional uses.

SEC. 8. EXPEDITED JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) FILING OF COMPLAINT.—

(1) DEADLINE.—Subject to paragraph (2), any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this Act or any action of the Secretary under this Act shall be filed—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), within the 90-day period beginning on the date of the action being challenged; or

(B) in the case of a complaint based solely on grounds arising after such period, within 90 days after the complainant knew or reasonably should have known of the grounds for the complaint.

(2) VENUE.—Any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this Act or any action of the Secretary under this Act may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

(3) LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF CERTAIN REVIEW.—Judicial review of a Secretarial decision to conduct a lease sale under this Act, including the environmental analysis thereof, shall be limited to whether the Secretary has complied with the terms of this Act and shall be based upon the administrative record of that decision. The Secretary's identification of a preferred course of action to enable leasing to proceed and the Secretary's analysis of environmental effects under this Act shall be presumed to be correct unless shown otherwise by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.

(b) LIMITATION ON OTHER REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary with respect to which review could have been obtained under this section shall not be subject to judicial review in any civil or criminal proceeding for enforcement.

SEC. 9. FEDERAL AND STATE DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount of adjusted bonus, rental, and royalty revenues from Federal oil and gas leasing and operations authorized under this Act—

(1) 50 percent shall be paid to the State of Alaska; and

(2) except as provided in section 12(d), the balance shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) PAYMENTS TO ALASKA.—Payments to the State of Alaska under this section shall be made semiannually.

SEC. 10. RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue rights-of-way and easements across the Coastal Plain for the transportation of oil and gas—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), without regard to title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.); and

(2) under title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.), for access authorized by sec-

tions 1110 and 1111 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3170 and 3171).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall include in any right-of-way or easement issued under subsection (a) such terms and conditions as may be necessary to ensure that transportation of oil and gas does not result in a significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain, including requirements that facilities be sited or designed so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of roads and pipelines.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall include in regulations under section 3(g) provisions granting rights-of-way and easements described in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 11. CONVEYANCE.

In order to maximize Federal revenues by removing clouds on title to lands and clarifying land ownership patterns within the Coastal Plain, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1302(h)(2) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3192(h)(2)), shall convey—

(1) to the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation the surface estate of the lands described in paragraph 1 of Public Land Order 6959, to the extent necessary to fulfill the Corporation's entitlement under sections 12 and 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 and 1613) in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement between the Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation effective January 22, 1993; and

(2) to the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation the remaining subsurface estate to which it is entitled pursuant to the August 9, 1983, agreement between the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States of America.

SEC. 12. LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT AID AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may use amounts available from the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund established by subsection (d) to provide timely financial assistance to entities that are eligible under paragraph (2) and that are directly impacted by the exploration for or production of oil and gas on the Coastal Plain under this Act.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The North Slope Borough, the City of Kaktovik, and any other borough, municipal subdivision, village, or other community in the State of Alaska that is directly impacted by exploration for, or the production of, oil or gas on the Coastal Plain under this Act, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible for financial assistance under this section.

(b) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Financial assistance under this section may be used only for—

(1) planning for mitigation of the potential effects of oil and gas exploration and development on environmental, social, cultural, recreational, and subsistence values;

(2) implementing mitigation plans and maintaining mitigation projects;

(3) developing, carrying out, and maintaining projects and programs that provide new or expanded public facilities and services to address needs and problems associated with such effects, including fire-fighting, police, water, waste treatment, medivac, and medical services; and

(4) establishment of a coordination office, by the north slope borough, in the city of kaktovik, which shall—

(A) coordinate with and advise developers on local conditions, impact, and history of the areas utilized for development; and

(B) provide to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report on the status of coordination between developers and the communities affected by development.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any community that is eligible for assistance under this section may submit an application for such assistance to the Secretary, in such form and under such procedures as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

(2) NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH COMMUNITIES.—A community located in the North Slope Borough may apply for assistance under this section either directly to the Secretary or through the North Slope Borough.

(3) APPLICATION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall work closely with and assist the North Slope Borough and other communities eligible for assistance under this section in developing and submitting applications for assistance under this section.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund.

(2) USE.—Amounts in the fund may be used only for providing financial assistance under this section.

(3) DEPOSITS.—Subject to paragraph (4), there shall be deposited into the fund amounts received by the United States as revenues derived from rents, bonuses, and royalties from Federal leases and lease sales authorized under this Act.

(4) LIMITATION ON DEPOSITS.—The total amount in the fund may not exceed \$11,000,000.

(5) INVESTMENT OF BALANCES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest amounts in the fund in interest bearing government securities.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To provide financial assistance under this section there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Pursuant to House Resolution 835, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 5429.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was brought up during the debate on the rule that this is not a new bill coming before the House. In fact, it is a bill that the House of Representatives has addressed many times in the past. It deals with opening up a small part of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate today we are going to have the opportunity to hear a lot about the pros and cons of opening up ANWR and the 2,000 acres that are included in the bill. We will talk about supply and the mean estimate of 10.5 billion barrels of oil that are available to Americans today. We will talk about jobs and the number of those in organized labor who look at between 250,000 and a million jobs, good paying family wage jobs that will be created by opening up this area. We will talk about revenue deficit reduction.

CRS recently did a study where they estimate that between \$111 and \$170 billion will come into the Federal Treasury as a result of opening this up. But one thing that we will talk considerably about is the environment and new technology. And to start today's debate on this, I would like to discuss that, because I believe this is probably one of the most important parts of this entire debate. Many times those that oppose new energy in this country, new energy of any kind whether we are talking about ANWR or alternative energy, they consistently vote against it no matter what it is. And what we are trying to do is open up these new energy sources so that we become less dependent on foreign energy instead of more dependent every single year.

When it comes to environmental protection, we have taken that into consideration and have debated this legislation for 25 years. And during those 25 years we have put in more and more in terms of environmental protection. Technology, obviously, has advanced over the last 25 years to the point today where the footprint has been reduced to the size of less than 2,000 acres. They talk about roads, the roads that will be built will be ice roads that will melt away in the summertime. In fact, over half of the bill, over half of the pages in the bill are dedicated to environmental protection. There is nowhere in the world that would have as much in terms of environmental protection and regulation as opening up this area. I do believe that is important. I do believe that it should be included in the bill. That is why it is in the bill.

But I will say that the false choice that we will hear from the other side today is either environmental protection or economic progress and economic development. That is not an option. The option that is in front of us is to protect our environment and to have a healthy, strong growing economy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have an historic time in our country. It is a time that requires the United States, this Congress, the President, to respond to an energy crisis. Skyrocketing gasoline prices, a real sense that we are importing too much oil from overseas and a real need for us to come together in a

comprehensive way for our country to respond.

We should be debating out here on the House floor today how we radically increase the amount of renewable fuels in our country that is consumed. We have to have a debate out here on the House floor about how we improve all of the vehicles which we drive in terms of their energy efficiency, all of the appliances which we use in our country in order to make them more efficient so we do not have to import so much oil. Instead, the response from the majority is to just bring out this bill, once again, which will not produce the first barrel of oil for at least 10 years in a pristine wildlife refuge in Alaska.

It is a failure not to have this debate be broader, be more comprehensive at this time, so that we can, in fact, 10 years from now, 10 years from now, have energy independence from the Middle East.

This bill will not even produce the first barrel of oil for 10 years. It is a red herring. It is a disservice to the American public. There were no hearings on this bill before it came out. They have changed the language that has always come out on to the House floor dealing with the arctic refuge with no hearings. It is something that should be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, the estimated oil that would result out of ANWR would be enough to fuel the entire State of Massachusetts for 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the man that has been entrusted to represent the entire State of Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is ironic, we listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts say that there has been no hearings. This is the 12th time we have passed this legislation concerning the needs of energy for this country. And by the way, for those listening to this program and those watching, Alaskans want to drill. Alaskans want to produce this oil for America. This is not our oil. We have never claimed that. Alaskans think it is necessary for this Nation.

It is ironic, I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts mention the fact that it will not relieve the high gas prices for 10 years. 10 years ago he said the same thing. I have been trying to do this for 15 years, actually 25 years. Passed it 12 times. President Clinton, by the way, vetoed it. President Clinton vetoed the same piece of legislation. We would have had a million barrels a day now flowing to the American consumer. Your gas prices would not be \$3.25 today. That would not have occurred.

Ironically, it is on the other side, the other side where all those wisdom people live, on the other side there are a group of individuals of the other party

that continue to block this source of fossil fuels to our consumers. Now, it might be, I am not sure it is, it might be they have a gas station in the Russell Building. For some reason, they do not want to produce any more gas. I am not sure that is real, but it could be. For some reason, they do not see the light.

I keep hearing about people supporting alternate sources of energy. And I have been advocating that. I have talked about nuclear. We cannot have nuclear. I have talked about let's burn more coal. We cannot burn coal. I talk about let's build a dam. Let's control the water flow in some of our rivers as it roars into the sea, let's control it and use it because it is truly a renewable source. But they cannot do that either.

All they ask us to do is conserve our way into prosperity. I will suggest to you respectfully that might happen if we did not have any more Americans. If we stopped our childbirth period, you might be able to conserve yourself into prosperity or into energy self-sufficiency. But as long as our population increases, we will consume more fossil fuel.

Now, I have done a little reading on this and ironically, we have a tremendous amount of coal in this country that we do not need to use just for electrical power. We can use it for liquid fuels. Unfortunately, Adolph Hitler did that because he had to. South Africa did it because they had to. Maybe some day we will get to a point we will have to use our coal for liquification also; but in the meantime, the largest source of oil that we know of in America is in Prudhoe Bay and in ANWR. ANWR is 74 miles away from Prudhoe Bay.

By the way, the gentleman from Massachusetts has never been to Prudhoe Bay. He was asked to go there to see this really pristine area which he speaks of. And by the way the people that live there want to drill. The Eskimos, the Inuits, want to drill there, but no, he didn't have the courtesy to go see when we had a hearing in Kaktovik because he knows all, and so do these Senators, they know all. But in the meantime, you are paying \$3.55 for a gallon of gasoline. And yes, that is a lot. But unfortunately, it is going to be more because if we have another Katrina which we might have, God help us, or if there is a hiccup in Iran, or someplace else in the Middle East, or if we have Venezuela who decides not to ship us 1.5 million barrels, you are going to pay more, and yet we have the domestic supply here.

Some would say we have to get off the fossil fuel habit. All right. Let's everybody buy a bicycle. Let's all buy a bicycle, and break our leg, and let's go back to being China. And by the way, who is the largest consumer of automobiles today? It is China, not us. China. They also, when somebody takes me to task, they say, well, they don't burn much fuel. They burn over 2.6 billion barrels of oil a year.

□ 1245

Think about that a moment, and they are going to consume more. We are not the only buyers around the world. There are other buyers.

We have to start developing our fossil fuels. We should be drilling offshore. Some people don't want that. We should be drilling in the Rockies; they don't want that. Most of all, we should be drilling in Alaska, and we want that. So if you don't want to drill in those other areas, if you don't want to burn coal, then at least recognize the valuable oil resource in Alaska.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's get it to the public. Let's make sure they have a source of energy they need. Let's stop listening to the naysayers. Let's do the job today.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am not from the other side, although I am from the other side on this argument. I am not from the other party. I am proud of my party affiliation, but I rise in strong opposition to this bill which would allow oil drilling in a pristine wilderness that was set aside by that radical environmentalist, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Is there any greater evidence that we are, as President Bush has said, addicted to oil? Astonishingly, this Congress has not voted on a single conservation measure since gasoline hit \$3 a gallon, not a single one, and yet poll after poll shows that conservation measures are the preferred option of the American people for dealing with high gasoline prices, the preferred option by a long shot.

The American public is thirsting to get their hands on fuel-saving technologies that companies are refusing to provide, and we have responded with nothing. Perhaps we have forgotten that our constituents are people, not companies.

The proponents of this bill would like to point out that if this legislation had been passed 11 years ago, ANWR would now be producing oil. Well, I would point out that if Congress had not blocked higher fuel economy standards 11 years ago, we would save far more oil than ANWR would produce. All those savings would increase as ANWR was being depleted.

We really are classic addicts. We would rather keep seeking our oil fix, our heroin, with all its attendant dangers, than shift to conservation, our methadone.

We are a Congress of prodigals who refuse to return home. Instead, we roam the world, laying waste to new territories to continue our spendthrift ways.

We ought not just oppose this bill, we ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for the time, and I appreciate my friend from New York who will be leaving this chamber, and I salute him for his own energy efficiency in producing a lot of heat but very little light in this regard.

Here are the facts we confront. No one is against conservation. No one is against alternative fuel sources. Indeed, as the author of the resolution on a solar tax provision passed in the energy bill and one who wants to extend that, I think I offer tangible testimony to embracing new technologies, but the fact is, in our current situation, sadly, we are dependent on foreign oil.

It is a fair question to again put before this House: Mr. Speaker, should we use environmentally responsible ways to explore for energy, especially where there is a proven energy reserve? We have such a reserve in ANWR. And understand the scope of the argument: The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the size of the State of South Carolina. The area where we would like to explore for the energy is about the size of John Foster Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. We should vote for this responsible measure.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am listening to my friend from Arizona. Two observations. One, everybody here is for all the good stuff. What matters is whether or not they are willing to actually invest in it. Where are their priorities? Where they are giving billions of dollars in unjustified breaks to oil companies who do not even need it, as opposed to starving investments in other programs.

The reference here to having a footprint the size of Dulles airport, hogwash. That is like saying a 300-acre golf course is actually only computed by the 4¼ inch in diameter golf holes. Do the math. That ends up to be about 240 square inches. But it ignores the golf paths. It ignores the tool shed, the clubhouse. It ignores the irrigation system, the tool sheds, the restrooms.

The fact is that the 2,000 acres, multiplied by all the ancillary activities, extends to a wide, wide area, and the notion of using things like ice roads, of course the other side does not believe in global warming, but if you look at the shorter and shorter period of time each year that you can use ice roads, you find out that that is becoming less active.

You have 20 years before you get peak production to have ultimately a penny a gallon saving. It is a foolish investment. This is the last place we should be drilling, not the next.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am the only person in this Congress that has

ever lived on the north slope for over a year. I know what pristine means. If we put you down there in the middle of winter, you would not think pristine. If we put you down in summer, which is 2 weeks in July, with the mosquitos, you would not think pristine, but once you live there and learn to appreciate what has happened there, it becomes pristine, but that should not be the issue.

This bill is an insurance policy against dependence on foreign oil. Let us develop this, not to consume it. Let us develop this resource, find out where we are, to have an insurance policy against foreign oil price gougers. Let us give our folks some protection at the pump by filling in this one piece. Again, exploration; not for consumption. Exploration is pressure against foreign oil suppliers now as we develop alternative forms of energy as we increase conservation.

I arrived here in a hydrogen car a few minutes ago. I never would have thought that would have happened. That is an alternative. E-85, I have got a bill to do that, again, to take away our dependence, but don't take this piece away from us. It will help us. It is not about consumption; it is about conservation.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and rise in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, the so-called American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. Once again, we will spend valuable legislative hours debating drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In the past few years, the House has repeatedly taken vote after vote on this issue. In each instance, Congress has ultimately not supported the opening of this refuge that was set aside by President Eisenhower 45 years ago.

The development footprint on the region, even using the most advanced technology and methods, would significantly disrupt this fragile ecosystem. Think about every heavy industrial factory and facility you know of, and then superimpose that image on a wilderness like Yellowstone Park or the National Forest or Park in your own home state and ask yourself if that is the legacy you want for your children.

Proponents of the bill argue that the 2,000 acre limitation on drilling would localize disruptions. However, this is only a gimmick: it fails to recognize the expansive nature of roads, pipelines, and machinery that will be built across 1.5 million acres. Rather, it is a cynical attempt to confuse and discount the effect of widespread development and blight on the entire region.

Other, more effective solutions to our energy needs exist. In addition to reviewing our domestic production capacity, focusing greater attention on renewable energy sources, alternate fuels, and more efficient systems and appliances would yield more net energy savings than could come from ANWR, and that priority would have a higher benefit for the nation's economic leadership and security.

I urge you to help put an end to the "drill ANWR first" solution and help move the Congress toward real energy security. Vote "No" on H.R. 5429.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am as concerned about oil prices at the pump as anyone. My constituents and I feel the pinch every single day, but as we consider this bill, let us look at the facts.

Ninety-five percent of the north slope is available for drilling, and it is roughly flat. There are 4,000 offshore leases that oil companies hold but have not yet developed. The government is offering leases in the National Petroleum Reserve regularly and just last week leased up 2.8 million acres more.

Directly relevant to this legislation is the fact that BP tried to develop wells adjacent to ANWR and recently moth-balled those wells because they produced so much less than expected.

On the other hand, developments in the alpine fields, which is way west of ANWR, (there is ANWR; Prudhoe Bay and then the alpine fields) those wells produced twice as much as expected, 120,000 barrels per day versus the expected 60,000 barrels today.

Lastly, existing fields are good for 20 to 25 years. They are almost entirely on State reserve lands, and we are now expanding leasing on State reserve lands, as well as Federal Reserve lands with very good success.

President Harding set aside the National Petroleum Reserve when the Navy converted from coal to oil to assure a supply of oil for the Navy in the future. That supply is assured without ANWR. Oppose this bill. Drilling in ANWR is not necessary or called for. Preserve the unique, pristine ecosystem.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to point out that the estimated oil from ANWR would fuel the State of Connecticut for 132 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for taking me to ANWR 4 years ago now. It was really an eye-opening experience for me. I was expecting to see beautiful water running through streams and trees and animals running around, and Mr. Chairman, that is not what we saw when we got there.

In fact, what we saw was just a barren slope. It is a barren slope, and with gas at \$3 a gallon and some places like California approaching \$4, it is time that the Congress pass this and make this into law.

I just want to point out to the American people that one of the reasons that this continues to be used as propaganda by the environmental community is because it is their number one source of fundraising throughout the country to use in political campaigns.

So I would hope that we would pass this here today in the House, and I would hope eventually we can move this through the Senate.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this so-called energy and jobs bill. There are simply some places that should be off limits to drilling. The arctic refuge is one of them.

I was privileged to visit this wildlife refuge and to camp on the shores. It is not a barren slope. The harm to polar bears, to caribou, millions of migratory birds and to the subsistence way of life to the natives there would be irreversible.

We have a moral responsibility to save wild places like the arctic refuge for future generations, and that is why our country has remained committed to its protection for nearly 50 years.

Drilling in the refuge will not solve America's energy problem. The Energy Department's own figures show that drilling would not change gas prices by more than a penny a gallon, and this would be 20 years from now. With 3 percent of the world's resources and 25 percent of the world's demand, it is pretty obvious this country cannot drill its way to energy security.

What we need to do is really improve energy efficiency standards, develop in full scale renewable and alternative energy and use the one resource we have in abundance, our creativity.

This bill is just a continuation of the backward thinking energy policies that have gotten us here in the first place.

Americans deserve cheaper, quicker, safer, cleaner energy policies that also safeguard the wild places we care so deeply about. This desperate obsession with drilling off our coastlines and in the arctic refuge has distracted us long enough.

It is time for Congress to stop wasting energy and start working on real and clean energy solutions.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1300

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

We have, as many have said, been through this issue before, but we have never been here in this situation. The suggestion is by those individuals that somehow, if we just drill ANWR, that we will have lower gasoline prices in the United States. Maybe they do not know it, but they should know it, that there is only now one price of oil. It is the world price of oil. The last time we had lower prices in the United States, the oil companies drilling in ANWR

sought to export that oil to Japan rather than sell it into the United States.

So these are not benevolent societies. These are profit-making organizations. And if the world price of oil is \$70 a barrel, it will be \$70 a barrel in ANWR. If it is \$100 a barrel it will be \$100 a barrel from ANWR. So the idea America is going to get this fix out of ANWR just isn't true. By the time ANWR comes on line, it may be 4 percent of imports. We should not ignore that, but the fact of the matter is, as so many people have pointed out, there is much more that we can do.

Many people have referred to the fact that the President stood here and told us we were addicted to oil. Well, the supporters of this legislation and the President of the United States are acting just like addicts. What they are doing is looking for one more quick fix. One more fix and then they will get religion tomorrow. One more fix and they will get well. One more fix and they will go into treatment.

What they are telling us is that they have postponed conservation, they have postponed new technologies, and they have postponed new sources of energy. This is the most oil-friendly administration in recent times, and we still find that we cannot meet the demands of this country. Because rather than deal with our demands, rather than deal with the technologies and the innovations that are available to us today, they have put all of their money on the oil companies. They put it there with royalty relief. They put it there with incentives. They have put it there with bonus bid systems and they have put it there with drilling in ANWR. It is a bankrupt policy.

What they are now doing in the 11th hour, while American consumers suffer from \$3.00 and \$3.50 gasoline, they are buying a lottery ticket. They are buying a lotto ticket called ANWR. And they are hoping to be able to redeem it. When it doesn't work, America will be deeper in debt and more dependent on foreign sources of oil than they are today. Because if they can get ANWR, they can once again postpone the commitments to conservation and technology.

They can scare you by suggesting Venezuela may cut off its oil. Well, let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they may sell that oil to the Chinese, but it is going to be refined in my district. Because the Chinese can't refine that oil. We know that most oil changes hands from the time it leaves one shore to get to the other shore. It may change ownership three or four times, sometimes as much as a dozen times. And it changes destination. But the fact of the matter is, it is not very attractive oil that Mr. Chavez is trying to sell or put on to the market.

So we have to understand what this means. What this comes down to really is about a sense of the future and our values. This ANWR, and I have been there, I meet the test. I have been

there, I have explored it, I have slept overnight there, I have stayed out and camped out in this area, so let me talk about it. This is about a pristine area that you either make a decision to industrialize or you don't.

The 2,000-acre footprint is a hoax. There is another 69,000 acres under Indian jurisdiction. They can build airports and they can do whatever they want. That is the nature of our relationship with the Indian tribes. So the 2,000 acres is a hoax. It is a decision about the value of this place, this very special place, and whether or not you are going to industrialize it.

Then it comes down to whether or not you believe in the ingenuity and the creativity of America. When we put together our innovation agenda, we met with the CEOs of the most advanced companies in the world. And they said to us, put energy innovation on the table, and you will drive a new generation of technology, a new generation of economic activity, and new jobs in America.

What are they putting on the table? They are putting on the table the old tired policy that somehow America can drill its way out of this problem. No, it can't. There's nobody who believes that is the situation. But you chose to stick with the 1960s, a 1970s policy, a 1980s policy, a 1990s policy. We would like to think about this century and new innovation and new places to go, and the excitement of new technologies, where America once again sells to the world those cutting-edge technologies.

We should not abandon wind energy to the Scandinavians, to the Europeans, and to the Spanish. No, we should have those technologies. We should be making the investments in alternative sources of energy and alternative sources of fuel. That is not what this legislation is about. This is about the one last lottery ticket, the one last gamble that the American people lose with this legislation.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Resources Committee.

This is an interesting debate. I want to try to refocus it a little bit more on the facts. The entire State of Texas, since oil was discovered in 1894, in Corsicana, Texas, has produced about 60 billion barrels of oil in over a million and a half wells in the last 112 years, 60 billion barrels. That is the number-one oil producing State in the United States.

The ANWR best-case estimate is, and this is the best case, it could be higher or lower, but the median case is 8 billion barrels in one field. That is 8 billion barrels. The second or third largest hydrocarbon bearing geology on the North American continent, and we have drilled one well. One well.

Gas prices everywhere in this Nation are somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3 a gallon, in some regions they are higher and in some regions a little lower, and we can't drill the third largest hydrocarbon bearing geology in North American continent?

They talk about the pristine nature, and it is pristine. I have been there. In my hometown of Arlington, Texas, right now there are drilling rigs within 300 feet of homes. Three hundred feet. Now, they are drilling for natural gas in the Barnett Shale, and you are telling me in Alaska that we can't drill a couple hundred wells that might produce as much as 2 million barrels a day for 30 years and lower gasoline prices for every American driver as much as 30 to 40 cents a gallon when in full production? That just doesn't make sense.

Please vote for this bill. Let's have a little common sense. Send it to the Senate and pass a reasonable supply-side policy in support of our energy policy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling is not the answer to high gas prices today or to the long-term energy needs of tomorrow. The fact is, we are addicted to oil. The proponents of this bill would have you believe that the only way to cure an addict is to feed the addiction at whatever cost, regardless of the effect on the environment, wildlife, or public health. Now, as a psychiatric social worker by profession, I can tell you this is not the way you kick a habit.

The best way to fight high gas prices now is to go after the suppliers. We should hold oil companies accountable for gouging consumers at the pump. We should institute a windfall profits tax to fund immediate investments in energy efficiency, conservation, and research into clean and sustainable sources of energy.

Instead of implementing these policies 5 years ago, this administration deliberately, they deliberately chose to fatten the wallets of its cronies in the oil and gas industry to feed this addiction. Let us not make the same mistake again.

Kick the habit and vote against this bill.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, rise today in strong support of H.R. 5429. I have been an avid proponent of

opening the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a long, long time now.

In 1980, when the Congress and President Carter created the nearly 20 million acres for ANWR, they set aside 1.5 million acres of ANWR's northern coastal plain for the express purpose of future energy exploration and development. I think the 96th Congress got it right when they did this, and I think it is about time we start to think about our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren.

You know, to say that we shouldn't drill on ANWR and that it will ruin little ANWR, 19 million acres, if we drill on 2,000 small acres, that is an insult to the American people's intelligence. And it is a threat to every youngster who is in the seventh grade on up, that they might have to fight a war for energy. This country will fight for energy. We will send them overseas for energy if we have to.

Let us pass this bill and have their quest be what branch of service do I not have to go into and what university can I enter?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5429. I have been an avid proponent of opening the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a very long time now. In 1980, when the Congress and President Carter created the nearly 20 million acres for ANWR, they set aside 1.5 million acres of ANWR's northern coastal plain for the express purpose of future energy exploration and development. I think the 96th Congress got it right when they did this, and I think it's about time we started to think about our children, our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren and moved forward with energy independence by using our own domestic resources. We are not going to turn the refuge into one giant oil well. In fact, of the 1.5 million acres set aside for exploration, the total amount of surface area covered by production facilities, such as drilling platforms or airstrips, would only be 2,000 acres. As well, H.R. 5429 includes an export ban of all oil or gas obtained from ANWR. All oil and natural gas produced on ANWR's northern Coastal Plain would be for domestic use only.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill to help reach our goal of energy independence, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling were convicted on all counts for cooking the books at Enron, yet that is exactly what is going on with this legislation today by perpetrating this fraud on the American taxpayer that they can expect a 50-50 split on the royalties received up in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, when we know today that is not true and it is not going to happen.

In fact, the State of Alaska, the legislature, last year, passed a resolution saying 50-50 is not acceptable, and

under the Alaska Statehood Act, they demand a 90-10 share. Our own friend and colleague from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG, was recently quoted in the Anchorage Daily News, and I quote, "I have to say 50-50 is something I don't relish. I think it's totally illegal. I believe we can win it in court."

This will cost the American taxpayer tens of billions of dollars if we don't get something in writing now before this legislation advances. I guess it is a good thing there is a Speech and Debate Clause in this Congress, because there is a whole lot of cooking the books in regards to the royalty that the American taxpayer can receive from private oil companies drilling in this pristine national wildlife refuge.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, opening up ANWR would give the State of Wisconsin 83 years of supply; and with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle are animated and engaged in this debate, and I commend them for that. But I would like to just offer one thought, and that is, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways. They just can't have it both ways. They can't be against everything that gets put on the table.

One thing we know for certain is that Americans are very, very tired of what they are paying at the pump. Another thing we know for certain is that actions from decades ago have caused the situation that we have before us today. And if we were to say there is a legacy that has been left us by environmental extremists, the high prices at the pump are it.

We don't explore for domestic oil because extremist environmental groups and liberals here in Congress oppose it. We haven't built a new refinery since the 1970s because extremist environmental groups and liberals here in Congress oppose it. The Democratic party is aligned with these groups that have supported having higher prices as a way to discourage oil usage. Their Presidential nominee in 2000, Al Gore, is not shy about praising higher prices for fuels.

Despite these facts, our liberal colleagues are out there slamming Republicans for high gas prices. Well, you know, they can't have it both ways. They have got to be consistent. Well, they are consistent. They are going to be consistent in opposing drilling in ANWR.

So today, we need to do a little setting the record straight and we need to put a little pressure on those that have chosen to stymie domestic exploration. We need to let the American people know that yes, indeed, there is a choice, and that there is indeed a way to lower fuel prices.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there are two things both sides of the aisle can agree with today. Demand is up. We look at our country, China, and India, and the price is up. Those are two things we all agree on.

What we don't agree on, I guess, which is why we have this debate this afternoon, is supply. The United States Government, including the Army Corps of Engineers, recently completed a study saying that peak oil is real; supply is down. Drilling for oil in ANWR, regardless of how much limited supply is there, will not, will not bring the price down.

The world burns, burns, 25 billion barrels of oil a year. We burn it.

□ 1315

ANWR will bring us about 5 billion barrels. That will postpone the world decline in oil reserves by only 2 or 3 months. Once we burn it, and the key word here is burn, once we burn it, it is gone. What is at the bottomless well? It is not oil. As some of the speakers have said, it is ingenuity, it is intellect, and it is initiative.

What else do we have oil use for? We have it for pharmaceutical products and medical products. We have it for plastic products. We have it for asphalt and the fabric of this civilization, and we are burning the legacy of our children's future.

Let us hold this one area for its pristine beauty and oil reserves for our children's future.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. I rise in strong support of H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

It is simple math: ANWR equals more oil supply and more oil supply equals lower prices; therefore, ANWR equals lower oil prices for American consumers.

Under this measure, just 2,000 acres of the 19-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would be used for energy production. It is only 1 percent of the total mass of land area.

Opening ANWR's 2,000 acres to safe energy exploration would create jobs in all 50 States. New research by the Defense Council Foundation estimates that over 1 million new jobs would be created by opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This act requires that the best commercial practices be used for energy production combined with the world's toughest environmental safeguards. ANWR is not the only solution for our Nation's energy needs, but it is a crucial element.

A report from the U.S. Energy Information Agency shows that energy development in ANWR would increase domestic production by nearly 20 percent by 2025. Had ANWR been in 15 years ago, it would be lowering oil prices today. I absolutely support renewable, clean energy resources. However, we have to be realistic. To get the equivalent amount of energy from wind gen-

eration as in ANWR, we would need 3.7 million acres' worth of wind farms, which is the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut combined, and gale-force winds 365 days a year for more than 30 years.

The American people believe we are doing the right thing by considering this bill today. A recent national poll by PacWest Communications shows that 59 percent of Americans favor oil and gas exploration and production in ANWR because our gas is at \$3 a gallon now.

Given this, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for American families and support H.R. 5429.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, yet another misguided bill that mistakenly believes we can drill or dig our way out of our current energy crisis. The supporters of the measure will argue yet again that drilling in this environmentally fragile area is the magic elixir to cure all of our energy woes. They will say we can lower gas prices and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, all while protecting the delicate ecosystem in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Unfortunately, those claims are based on wishful thinking and are not grounded in fact.

The fact is that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will have no significant impact on our Nation's energy independence. All it will do is continue to pursue failed policies and priorities.

Last year, Congress passed an energy bill that provided massive tax giveaways to the oil and gas companies. One year later, energy costs have actually risen, and so have the profits of oil and gas companies. We missed a chance to take a hard look at the global energy forecast and plan accordingly to protect American interests.

Mr. Speaker, we should be making major investments in energy self-reliance, infrastructure, and new technologies. It astounds me that the Nation that pulled together to put a man on the Moon is not leading the world in developing new, clean, and renewable energy sources.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and vote against drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5429, yet another misguided bill that mistakenly believes that we can drill or dig our way out of our current energy crisis. The supporters of the measure will argue yet again that drilling in this environmentally fragile area is the magic elixir to cure all our energy woes. They will say that we can lower gas prices and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, all while protecting the delicate ecosystem in the wildlife refuge. Unfortunately, those claims are based on wishful thinking and not grounded in fact. The fact is that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will have no significant

impact on our Nation's energy independence. All it would do is continue to pursue failed policies and priorities.

Last year, Congress passed an energy bill that provided massive tax giveaways to the oil and gas companies. One year later, energy costs have actually risen, and so have the profits of oil and gas companies. We missed a chance to take a hard look at the global energy forecast and plan accordingly to protect American interests. Rising demand by India and China will likely guarantee high oil prices in the future, whether or not we drill in the Arctic. Instead, we should be making major investments in energy self-reliance, infrastructure, and new technologies. It astonishes me that the nation that pulled together to put an American on the moon is not leading the world in developing new, clean and renewable energy sources. Such an effort would revitalize our economy, improve our environment, and strengthen our national security. Instead of that type of vision, however, the leadership in Congress and the White House just offers Americans more backwards and wasteful policies like drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

It is telling that the Rules Committee did not allow amendments on this bill. If we had a broader debate about energy policy, we might have to confront the fact that a minimal increase in automobile fuel efficiency standards would have a greater impact on gasoline costs and energy independence than drilling in the Arctic Refuge would. We might have to admit that we can guarantee more well-paying American jobs by developing new clean technologies. Yet we were denied that debate.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the failed policies of the past. Vote against drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the legislation authorizing oil and gas exploration in ANWR. The House debated this bill many times, and many of the arguments are so familiar I think that some of us could stand up here without even talking points; but I think we need to hear some other points today.

Most importantly, oil and gas development does not destroy the environment. This bill only affects 2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres. Oil and gas development on the North Slope has not reduced wildlife, destroyed caribou or other animals. I have been to Alaska and the North Slope a number of times. In fact, when I was there one time in August, the only thing I saw was white because it was a blizzard. That was in the middle of August. I don't know, maybe global warming has changed that since I was there 6 years ago.

We have been pumping at Prudhoe Bay for 30 years, and that is just 80 miles west of ANWR. The less we produce domestically, the more oil tankers we have to bring into our ports. And at least the oil tankers in Alaska are U.S. flag ships and we know they are U.S. crews, unlike the tankers that bring in the oil from other places

in the world that are staffed by anyone.

It is true that passing this bill will not lower gas prices immediately, but in the medium term it will. If we had opened the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in 2000–2001, that supply would have helped us when the Gulf of Mexico production was shut down last year because of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

When oil is flowing from ANWR to the continental United States, our economy would be much stronger. The price for oil in the U.S. would have fewer spikes, and we would be less vulnerable to foreign nations using the "oil weapon."

Opponents of ANWR also say we should do alternatives instead of ANWR. We need to do both. I supported the energy bill with its historic move to ethanol, and I fully support major U.S. research efforts into alternative transportation technologies. However, there is not enough corn in the U.S. to make 100 percent ethanol for all the U.S. cars, and hydrogen fuel cells are still years away for the average American.

Most of us are going to be using gasoline made from crude oil for the next 15–20 years. Oil and gas development in ANWR is not the final solution, but it is the bridge to the future of energy technology.

Finally, ANWR is also an important issue for working families who are most at risk from the spikes in the price of gasoline and who are the least able to take advantage of these alternatives.

This legislation is expected to provide 250,000 to 1 million jobs for American families, and that is why organized labor supports this bill. Many opponents of ANWR drive SUVs, and they can afford the high gas prices. In my district, they cannot afford the high cost of hybrids. But working families are going to need affordable gasoline for the next 15–20 years until the price of alternatives comes down.

Mr. Speaker, you can be pro-ANWR and pro-alternative, and that is why I ask support for H.R. 5429.

Environmentally fragile, I have heard that so much. I represent an area on the western Gulf of Mexico, and we are also environmentally fragile, but we have been producing for America for a number of years. We just need some help from other areas in our Nation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any mention when my colleague from New York spoke as to how much the fuel needs of New York would be met if ANWR were allowed to go through. I suggest that it probably would be somewhere in the range of 10 years, maybe. What about after that? What do we do after that? This is a red herring. This is a distraction. This is not about any one particular State's needs. This is about the needs of our country. Why are we not addressing the needs of our country?

This is like dressing a pimple on the cheek of an elephant when the problem is the entire elephant. We need to be looking out for the interests of the entire country, not just one particular State and its needs.

We should be talking about alternative fuel sources and developing them in this country. This whole discussion is a political misdirection and a ploy to take the focus off the issues this country is facing today.

I ask my colleagues to reject this political ploy. Vote against this bill. Do not allow the pristine country that we are talking about, ANWR, to be disrupted. Let us leave it for future generations, as it is meant to be.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, is it too much to ask for us to protect the last remaining 5 percent of the Alaskan coast? Is that too much to ask? To give to the Creator his pristine creation?

We do not put oil derricks in Yellowstone National Park. We do not put them in Zion National Park. We do not put them in Mount Rainier National Park, and we should not industrialize this precious Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

There is a pattern here. There is a pattern. Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling were just convicted of fraud on what Enron did to us. And this administration and this Congress let Enron take billions of dollars from ratepayers because they were in fact in the pockets of these energy companies.

Now we have a similar situation. I will never forget when DICK CHENEY looked at us and we begged for help from him to stop Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling from taking money from ratepayers, and you know what he told us, he said you Democrats just don't understand markets.

Now I guess we just don't understand energy either. We understand that we should protect the national jewels in the crown of this country. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, here we are again debating a bill that has been rejected by Congress and the American people too many times to count. So how many times do we have to go through this obsessive exercise? How many times will we waste our time debunking the myth that drilling in the Arctic will solve our energy problems and make us energy independent? How many times do we have to reject the notion that drilling will not harm the native peoples or the environment of the Arctic? How many times will the sponsors of this measure try to hide the fact that it will do nothing to reduce gas prices?

Mr. Speaker, our country needs real solutions to our energy problems,

namely, one that is affordable, stable and reduces the impact on the environment. Instead of wasting our time with this stale proposal that has been rejected so many times, let us spend time on incentives for clean air technologies and stop this head-in-the-sand approach to energy policy.

This is a great country. Let us start acting like we have the will and the ability to face the challenges of the future, and we can begin by rejecting H.R. 5429.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle state that we should be discussing and using alternative energies. I agree. But where are they going to get them?

The veterans in my district drive 305 miles one way from my hometown to the VA clinic. That is 305 miles. Where are they going to stop and fill up their car with this alternative energy that our friends are talking about today?

Many of the spots in New Mexico have no primary provider, health care providers, and yet our opponents want to simply gloss over that fact and say we need wind energy. When is wind energy going to start fueling these cars? The truth of the American situation today is we drive cars. We have large, expansive spaces in many States, and the only source of gasoline is from petroleum. Now what we have today is a \$3 price on gasoline. That is because we had choices in the past not to develop our refineries, number one; or, number two, not to increase the supply of petroleum products. We are paying \$3 a gallon today because of our decisions.

If we choose not to develop energy in this country, we are on the way to \$4, \$5 and \$6 a gallon gasoline because our friends in the rest of the world are beginning to demand more.

When I look at a chart of crude oil prices over a period of years, I can see when it is overlaid with the demand of the Chinese, the demand of the Chinese is increasing just about like the price of crude oil is increasing. There is no accident in that. The price of petroleum is where it is, not through the simplistic explanations of our friends. The price of petroleum is where it is because of the law of supply and demand. That law of supply and demand says when the supply is less, you will pay more, which is exactly what we are doing today.

Vote for the bill, expand the drilling and give the American consumer a lower price for gasoline at the pump.

□ 1330

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, while Rome is burning, we are eating grapes. We waste energy. We consume 25 percent of the world's energy, yet only 2.7 percent of the world's oil reserves are in the United States of America. We are depleting our savings account.

The President was right. We are addicted to oil.

GEORGE MILLER and other Members of Congress are right. We are addicted to oil. We are addicted to fossil fuel. We consume fossil fuel at an alarming rate. We need to conserve.

Mr. BOEHLERT is right. The proponents of this bill like to point out that if this legislation had been enacted 11 years ago, ANWR would now be producing oil. But Mr. BOEHLERT points out if we had higher conservation standards 11 years ago, we would save more oil than we would get from ANWR.

The bottom line to me is very clear. ANWR is a national set aside area. It is a pristine area. It is a small part of Alaska and should not be mined.

Why don't we mine the rest of Alaska, all the other parts of the northern slope and the rest of Alaska?

We have only 2.7 percent of the world's oil reserves. We need to say "no" to the mining of ANWR, "yes" to exploring other areas, "yes" to other energy including, renewable energy, "yes" to conservation. Increase the mileage standards of SUVs, minivans and trucks, increase the mileage standards of cars, and we will save far more than we will ever get from ANWR.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the urgency and that the last speaker said that we should save our assets, keep the money in the bank. I had a friend whose father was in his 80s. His father did not spend much money. His son went to his dad one day and said, Dad, you are putting every penny in the bank; why are you doing that? He said, I am going to save it until I am old. The son said, Dad, if you are not there yet, you better start spending your money.

I don't know at what point the opponents of this legislation say that the price has to get to before we start spending out of our savings account. But if \$70 a barrel doesn't compel you that we should dip into that savings account, I am not sure where you are going to be compelled.

The fact is that we have the resources. We need to utilize the resources. We need to buy ourselves the time while we convert to these renewables that were incentivized in the energy bill last year. But the renewables are going to take 20 years to get to market. I am not sure when our opponents feel like we should dip into that savings account. I think it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, war is not an acceptable energy policy. This bill is an attempt to dupe the American public into thinking that drilling in ANWR will lower gas prices. It is a disservice to the American people. This bill is really about serving ANWR to

the oil industry lobby, something they have coveted for a very long time.

Just by making cars modestly more efficient, Americans could save \$25 billion a year and 1 million barrels of oil per day. Republicans should really deal with our energy problems and not this handout to the oil lobby.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is like a broken record. The majority is trying to drill our way to energy independence. Last week, they were trying to drill off our coasts, and this week, it is ANWR. Even the big oil companies know that oil in ANWR would only fill America's appetite for oil for maybe 6 months and that it would not be available for 10 years.

To reduce the pain of high-fuel costs for America's families, we need to use existing technology to make our cars, our SUVs and light trucks go farther on a gallon of gas. We need to raise CAFE standards. We need to invest in alternative energies and alternative fuels. We need to become independent of fossil fuels. We need to vote against this bill and head in the right direction and not drilling off our coasts or in ANWR.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, two major studies were done at the expense of our U.S. Government; one by the Department of Energy, the other by the U.S. Army; both indicating that we are at or will shortly be at peak oil with potentially devastating consequences for our country.

But drilling ANWR now is not an appropriate response to that. We have only about 2 percent of the world's reserves of the oil. We use 25 percent of the world's oil. We import about two-thirds of what we use.

Mr. Speaker, with those statistics, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our national security interest to use up a little bit of oil as quickly as we can.

If we could drill ANWR tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, what would we do the day after tomorrow? Talking about tomorrow, we are saddling our children, our grandchildren, with an unconscionable debt. Will we add to that the insult of using up the little bit of liquid fossil fuels remaining? This is not the right thing to do at this time.

Mr. POMBO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, drilling in ANWR brings us no closer to breaking our dependence on oil, even under

the most optimistic scenario. Many of us have spent the last several years working to find ways to stem the hemorrhaging of factory jobs in this country.

Nothing would do that like lowering the energy costs for our manufacturers, for our chemical and fertilizer plants. If we open ANWR, we tell our manufacturers that we are satisfied with holding the line. If we want to create more than a few good jobs and spur the economy on a scale that could rival what we saw in the 1990s with the rise of the Internet, we should not be debating whether or not to open ANWR to drilling. We should boldly invest in renewable energy everywhere in our country. We should look not to the past but to the future. We should vote "no" on this bill and "yes" to reducing our dependence on oil.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, look, this bill makes no sense at all: drilling for dead dinosaurs and making that more valuable than liveable wildlife is just crazy. Even the Governor of California opposed offshore drilling last week. All the people of California oppose drilling in ANWR. I strongly support a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, legislation to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. It's the same bad idea now as it was the last 12 times we voted on and defeated this issue.

The House Leadership just doesn't get it. Last week on a bipartisan basis we defeated an amendment to develop and drill for gas on the outer continental shelf.

We cannot drill our way out of high gas prices with this bill or any other piece of legislation. It just isn't possible.

We are missing an opportunity here; today's misguided attempt continues to bumble along searching for 19th century answers to 21st century problems. We need 21st century solutions such as conservation and using renewable and alternative sources.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today has been touted as a "fix" to high gas prices by the proponents of this legislation. It will not lower prices now or later.

Even the Bush Administration's own Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that at best the addition of oil from the Arctic Refuge to our supplies would maybe, and this is a big maybe, lower the price of gas by a penny . . . 20 years from now.

On the other hand, if we were to pass meaningful increases to our CAFE standards and increased average fuel economy by 3 miles per gallon, consumers could be saving as much as \$25 billion a year in fuel costs within a few short years.

During his State of the Union Address, the President acknowledged our addiction to oil.

I hoped that this would mean Congress could move forward to discuss real energy solutions, solutions that protect our national security, our citizens, and our environment, as I continue to believe that we can do. Instead as we go into the summer driving season, the only ideas that have had a voice on this floor is for drilling in our oceans and our pristine areas.

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to move past this divisive debate to discuss real energy solutions for the 21st century?

I urge this leadership and this administration to develop meaningful legislation based on new technologies that lead us to energy independence. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same. H.R. 5429 continues the Republican energy solution of postponing real action.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for engaging in this debate. More so, I want to thank him for taking us to Alaska, a whole group of us. Several weeks ago, many of us went up to the village of Kaktovik and had a chance to sit with the Inupiat people and talk to them about what it is they really wanted on their lands.

I represent more Native Americans than anyone else in Congress. While I was there, they talked about a sovereignty issue. We had 400 people in the gym. We asked them, how many people don't want us using the newest technologies to go after this resource? Two people stood up. One was a white woman from San Francisco, a lawyer.

So I am telling you, from the people, they want sovereignty. They want their own self-determination. They want to be able to use their own resources to better themselves and better their lives. Seventy-five percent of the people of Alaska want to use new technology to go after this.

It is not a silver bullet. To say it is, is a false argument. It is an energy bridge. It allows us to bring enough hydrocarbon fuel down in the 48 States to help us bridge to the next energy generation, from a guy who drives a hybrid, because I know that argument is going to come up, a guy who drives a hybrid, not those big SUVs like they drive up there in Boston. Vote "yes" on this bill, and let's get it done.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic debate. We have OPEC and the oil industry tipping consumers upside-down at the pump every single day. Rather than having a debate out here on the House floor on the amount of alternative renewable fuels we use which would dramatically increase by millions of barrels a day; rather than debating out here on the floor how we would increase the fuel efficiency standards over the next 10 years of all of the vehicles we drive in the United States, which would push out additional millions of barrels of oil a day, so that, 10 years from today, there would be no imported oil from the OPEC countries, no imported oil from the Persian Gulf; instead, we are debating a bill which won't produce the first barrel of oil for 10 years, and it will come from a pristine wildlife refuge.

That just shows you how bankrupt the Republican energy strategy is. It is almost Memorial Day weekend. Mil-

lions of drivers are getting ready to go to the pump to get ready for their long drives only to pay \$3.20, \$3.40 a gallon. The answer from the Republican party is, we will help you 10 years from now from a gas station we create in the pristine wildlife refuge in Alaska to send oil down to California to put into SUVs to get 15 miles a gallon. That is not the answer to this crisis.

We have a choice, make our country more addicted to oil or chart a new direction. We need cleaner air and water rather than more pollution. We need abundant, renewable energy and more efficient vehicles to drive in our country. We put 70 percent of all the oil we consume into gasoline tanks.

Instead, we are here talking about something that will not happen for 10 years. The American people want to know, when will the Congress stand up for them and make sure that the oil industry and OPEC stops sticking them up at the pump? Because our country has been paralyzed for 6 years by this Congress and by the Republican White House, which unfortunately is still too controlled by the oil industry vote to ensure that we protect this Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have had this debate before many, many times with all of my colleagues that had an opportunity to come to the floor today and voice their opinions.

Quite frankly, this is about a lot more than just opening up ANWR. We have narrowed this down to a couple of thousand acres out of an area nearly the size of 100 million acres, and that is what this bill actually deals with. But, obviously, we have heard a lot about energy policy in general.

Unfortunately, our energy policy in this country for the last 30 years has basically been to become more and more and more dependent on foreign energy sources.

Every time an idea has come forward about opening up a new area, about creating more domestic energy, about keeping jobs here at home, those on the minority side have voted against it. We have heard them talk a lot today about alternative energy and renewable energy, and they are right. We need to invest in renewable energy and alternative energy. They are absolutely correct on that.

In fact, last year, we had a vote on alternative renewable energy, and almost every single one of them voted against it. They are not consistent in terms of their arguments and their votes. Quite frankly, we do need to adopt an energy policy that really does reflect the future of America.

But unless we have people that are willing to create domestic energy, whether that be from increased fossil fuels or whether it be from renewables, we need to have a policy that creates

increased domestic energy. Right now we don't have that policy.

ANWR is not the answer. ANWR is a small part of the answer. All of the things that you have heard about today are things that we have to do. But we cannot get them through Congress. We cannot get them through the other body unless you are willing to support them.

□ 1345

So far, your response to everything has been "no." And you have this pie-in-the-sky that we are going to invent a 100-mile-per-gallon carburetor and all of a sudden our problems are going to go away. They were talking about that the last time we had an energy crisis under Jimmy Carter, and it never happened.

I know, somebody bought the patent to that carburetor and it is hidden away in a safe somewhere. Well, you know, your arguments hold about as much water now as they did 30 years ago when you started making them.

We need to develop energy here at home. That involves more fossil fuels, because that is what powers our Nation. But it also involves renewable energy, and it involves alternatives. You have got to come up with something better than "no."

Right now gas in my district is almost \$3.50 a gallon. We need to do something about providing energy here at home. You can't continue to say "no" on everything.

I encourage my colleagues to finally step up and begin to pass a domestic energy policy that creates energy here at home. ANWR is the first step in that. We will have the opportunity to continue to vote on new technology and new renewable resource issues, and we will see how many of you will step up to the plate and actually vote for the things that today you are saying you are in favor of, because your past history has shown you are not going to vote for it.

So as your constituents continue to pay more for gasoline and more for electricity and more for products because the cost of energy has gone up, as they continue to lose their jobs because the cost of natural gas has gone up, at what point will you step up and say "yes" to something?

Support the underlying bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

America's natural resources are diminishing daily. Places like Fossil Rim Wildlife Center just outside of Dallas, with its 1800 acres of unspoiled natural beauty and endangered Texas Prairie Chickens, need the support and protection of Congress.

Defending our natural resources is our responsibility as Federal representatives. All Americans benefit from unspoiled lands, clear skies, and wild places to enjoy.

Drilling the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not the answer to our oil crisis. That strategy is not forward-thinking and won't sustain our energy needs for very long.

What we need instead are greater investments in energy efficiency and alternative fuels.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed ANWR drilling and I will oppose ANWR drilling again this time around.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act, H.R. 5429. When Congress put a similar bill on then-President Clinton's desk in 1996, he vetoed that bill arguing it wasn't needed because if we opened up ANWR for oil and gas development, it would take 10 years for oil and gas to start flowing to Americans from ANWR. Today it is 2006—10 years after President Clinton's veto and 10 years of Senate filibusters. American consumers could certainly benefit today from the 1 million barrels per day that would be flowing from ANWR had we moved forward with oil and gas development in ANWR in 1996.

Oil and gas prices continue to rise and our dependence upon foreign sources of oil is at an all time high. If we are really serious and realistic about economic and national security, we must approve this bill and reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources.

Contrary to the many myths that have clouded this debate over the years, we have the technology and know-how to safely produce energy in ANWR with minimal intrusion into the surrounding environment. Safe and successful oil drilling on wildlife refuges is not idle speculation. We know it's possible because we have done it time and time again. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Government Accountability Office, over 30 refuges currently have oil and gas wells on them without incident. Since the 1970s, for instance, there's been drilling in Prudhoe Bay—just 80 miles east of ANWR. Porcupine Caribou herds and other wildlife still roam freely there and in numbers greater than before there was drilling in the area. And it's important to note that the technology involved in ANWR drilling will far surpass what has been successfully used in the past.

Since oil and gas can be safely produced in ANWR, we must ask ourselves why we continue to ignore an easily accessible source of energy even as the price for oil hovers near \$60 a barrel, American consumers are paying \$3 a gallon for gasoline, and the increasing costs of natural gas is driving electric utility bills significantly higher each year.

This is particularly concerning given our growing dependence upon foreign sources of oil from countries and regions that are increasingly volatile. In 1982, the U.S. imported 32 percent of its oil. Today, that figure has grown to 56 percent. Unless we expand domestic production, estimates indicate that by 2020 upwards of 65 percent of U.S. oil will come from foreign countries. It is irresponsible to stand idly by and allow the next generation of Americans to be so subjected to the whims of foreign governments.

Some have said that the amount of oil we might get from ANWR isn't enough to significantly impact our energy supply. Such assertions are baseless and fly in the face of the facts. ANWR's coastal plain is the single greatest onshore prospect for future oil and could increase our domestic production by 20 percent in years ahead. Moreover, recent estimates indicate that ANWR could safely provide one million barrels of oil per day—that's

roughly the daily number of barrels the U.S. imports from Saudi Arabia. To put this in perspective, oil from ANWR could fuel my home state of Florida—the 3rd most populous state—for 29 years. In short, ANWR's potential impact on our future energy supply is not insignificant, and could provide valuable oil supplies even as we continue to move forward developing alternative sources of energy.

Opening ANWR is at least 10 years overdue and it is a common sense approach to help meet our growing energy needs. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, once again, we have before us legislation to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to drilling.

My question is: What problem are we trying to solve?

If this is an attempt to lower gas prices, then this bill won't do the job. According to a July 2005 report of the non-partisan Energy Information Administration of the Department of Energy, Arctic oil will reduce the price of a gallon of gas by less than a penny.

If this is an attempt to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, then this bill is not the solution. Whether we drill in the Arctic or not, U.S. dependence on foreign oil is projected to grow. The simple fact is that the U.S. has less than 3 percent of the world's oil reserves yet our country is responsible for 25 percent of the world's annual petroleum consumption.

This bill will rip apart a 1.5-million-acre wildlife refuge for a 6 month supply of oil.

The proponents claim that the drilling will be limited to a mere 2,000 acre area. As a point of comparison, the 100-mile-long, 12-lane New Jersey turnpike covers 1,800 acres. That limitation applies only to where the drilling will occur, not to supporting infrastructure, including roads. In addition, no requirement exists for the 2,000 acres to be contiguous. Drilling stations can be spread throughout the refuge, dotting the landscape.

Mr. Speaker, we have other choices. Choices that will preserve sensitive wilderness areas, reduce air pollution, and end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. We should be improving the fuel economy of cars and trucks, which stands at the same level today as it was 20 years ago. We have the technology today to raise the standard for automobiles by 10 percent over the next decade, saving 1.1 million barrels of oil per day and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 85 million metric tons a year.

House Democrats developed an Innovation Agenda, which was introduced last November. In it, we proposed cutting petroleum-based fuels by rapidly expanding production and distribution of synthetic and bio-based fuels such as ethanol derived from cellulosic sources, and by deploying new engine technologies for fuel-flexible, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and biodiesel vehicles. This is not far-off technology. It is at hand, and if we promote it now, we can end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil in a decade and we can do it without drilling in the Arctic or other sensitive areas.

These are the steps we should be taking, not the destructive policies which this bill represents. I urge my colleagues to reject the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, no one should be fooled by the inventive title of the legislation pending before the House today. The sponsor of this measure calls his bill the "American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act." A better title would be the "Big Oil Give-Away and Accountability Evasion Act."

The plain truth is that what we have here is an old proposal dressed up with a fancy, new title. Since 1995, Congress has voted again and again on the question of whether or not to open up the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. Just last December, the Alaska Delegation tried to force drilling in ANWR through the Congress by attaching it in the dead of night to a must-pass defense bill. The Senate refused, and so here we are today debating yet another bill to turn the Arctic Refuge over to the oil companies.

Drilling in ANWR will not bring down gasoline prices—not today and not tomorrow. No one knows how much economically recoverable oil lies underneath the Refuge. We do know that even if the Refuge were opened to oil exploration tomorrow, it would take nearly a decade for any Arctic Refuge oil to reach the market. Even if the estimates of economically recoverable oil in ANWR panned out, oil from ANWR would account for only about 3 percent of domestic oil use in 2025.

Of the many actions we could be voting on today to help consumers at the pump, it speaks volumes that opening up the Refuge to oil drilling is the first choice of the Leadership of the House.

For the last 6 years, the Majority leadership and the President have set the energy policy for the United States. The Bush Administration unveiled its energy plan in 2001. Although over 95 percent of the recommendations in that plan have been implemented, our Nation still confronts sky-high gas prices, growing dependence on foreign sources of energy, and record profits for the oil industry. In 2005, the six largest oil companies reported \$110 billion in profits. These profits will likely set a new record this year. The Majority's philosophy is that what's good for ExxonMobile is good for American consumers, but we have learned that this is not the case.

So essentially what the House Leadership is offering the country is more of the same. If they were serious about dealing with energy, the Majority would schedule a debate and a vote on H.R. 4479, the Energy Consumer Relief Act, which would roll back billions of dollars in tax breaks, royalty holidays and subsidies to oil and gas companies and make that funding available to bring down home heating costs through the LIHEAP program, as well as provide relief from high energy costs to farmers and small businesses.

Yesterday, Representative VISCLOSKEY sought to offer a far-sighted amendment to the Energy and Water bill to provide \$750 million to move the United States towards energy independence. This amendment would have made important investments in alternative energy, including ethanol and biofuels; renewable energy research and development, and energy efficiency. Yet, the Majority blocked the House from even considering this proposal.

I realize that the House will likely repeat its previous votes on this issue today, but I strongly encourage the House to take more meaningful action to deal with our country's energy problems soon.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, we can't drill our way to energy independence. Although this Nation is responsible for 25 percent of the world's oil demand, we own only 3 percent of the reserves.

Time and again we've debated opening ANWR to oil exploration. It fails every time because a majority knows it's as misguided an

idea as leading off our energy policy by rewarding \$16 billion worth of tax-breaks to oil companies.

Opening ANWR is not the silver bullet for lowering gas prices. We need to shift the focus from supply back toward reducing our demand. If we don't we'll remain at the mercy of Big Oil.

We must commit more toward conservation and research into renewable energy if we're going to achieve energy independence once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our constituents more than what appears to be a debate about reform. It's time that we deliver a policy that embraces real energy reform.

Mr. Speaker, we can simply do better.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads: We can either perpetuate our energy dependence on oil, or we can start taking the necessary steps to develop alternative and renewable energy sources, and wean our Nation off oil.

Sadly, Congress has failed to recognize the urgency of America's energy crisis and will vote today to allow drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Increased drilling for limited quantities of an unsustainable resource in the ANWR is not the answer to America's energy problems, and I oppose this short-sighted legislation.

We cannot depend on this "quick fix" to solve a calamity whose ramifications reach far beyond the gas pump. The Bush administration claims that tapping this oil reserve will cause prices to fall, but the simple reality is that it will take years before oil from the ANWR actually makes it to a barrel. Even then, there is not enough oil in the ANWR to reduce our dependence on foreign sources.

Instead, Congress must focus on promoting alternative fuels, clean energy technologies, fuel cells, micro turbines, hybrid (electric) engines and bio-fuels. California and the South Bay are extremely well-positioned to lead in developing these alternatives.

While renewable and alternative fuels are the future, the time to act is now. There is no reason to take a step backwards by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deceptively titled American-Made Energy & Good Jobs Act, H.R. 5429.

Is this the answer to high gas prices and our dependence on foreign oil? I think not.

The Department of Energy says drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will do nothing to bring gas prices down. In fact, if we were to drill in this pristine wildlife sanctuary tomorrow, it would only lower gas prices by a penny per gallon and we would not even see the so-called savings for 20 years.

And, it will scarcely make a ripple on our dependence on foreign oil, nor will it increase our national security. Even by the most optimistic estimates, oil from the Refuge will never meet more than two percent of the energy needs in America.

Drilling in the Arctic Refuge should not be taken seriously as a band-aid for meeting our immediate or future energy needs.

Instead, we need to continue to use modern technology to make cars go farther on a gallon of gas; encourage the production and purchase of hybrid cars; develop innovative energy sources; and invest in clean energy.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose H.R. 5429.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill.

It wasn't long ago that President Bush stood in this chamber and rightly said we need to end our addiction to oil. But instead of working to break our fossil-fuel habit, today the Republican leadership of the House today is calling for one more fix.

Instead of putting together a prescription that will treat the underlying problem, they are trying to get us to swallow their favorite nostrum of drilling on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

That would be bad enough if what they are peddling was just a harmless placebo. But it is not only ineffective, it is harmful to many important resources and values.

Any doctor will admit that any drug can have side effects, and that writing a prescription involves weighing the potential benefits against the risks.

Here, we are being asked to take a chance that there is a significant of economically recoverable oil on the coastal plain. So, we first must decide what stakes we are willing to risk, and then weigh the odds.

The stakes are the coastal plain. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service says it "is critically important to the ecological integrity of the whole Arctic Refuge" which is "America's finest example of an intact, naturally functioning community of arctic/subarctic ecosystems." In fact, because of the abundance and variety of its wildlife, the refuge has been compared to Africa's Serengeti. This area is a habitat for caribou, polar bears, grizzly bears, snow geese, 135 species of migratory birds, eagles, wolves, sheep, and muskoxen.

And what are the odds? Well, as anyone in the oil business knows, unless a well is drilled it is impossible to say whether even the most promising location actually has oil or gas. But the best estimate of the potential of the coastal plain is by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). In 1998 they estimated that if the price of oil drops to less than \$16 per barrel (as it did a few years ago) there would be no economically recoverable oil in the coastal plain. At \$24 per barrel, USGS estimated there is a 95 percent chance of finding 1.9 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil in the refuge's coastal plain and a 50 percent chance of finding 5.3 billion barrels. And at today's prices, presumably the odds are better for economically recoverable amounts.

But when you compare that with the amount of oil America uses each day, it is clear that at best there is a chance of finding several months' supply of oil in the coastal plain.

On the other hand, there is one thing that is a 100 percent sure bet—drilling will change everything on the coastal plain forever. According to the Department of the Interior, oil and gas exploration and development in the Refuge would permanently and irreversibly: Destroy the unique wildland values of a world-class natural area; disrupt ecological and evolutionary processes in one of the most pristine conservation areas in the North American arctic; diminish the Refuge's scientific value as a benchmark for understanding these processes; damage the biological and ecological integrity of the entire Refuge.

I do not think we should take that bet. We do not need to trade one non-renewable resource—the wilderness qualities of the coastal plain—for non-renewable oil.

There are less-sensitive places where oil may be found. And there are even better alternatives as well, including steps to conserve energy and greater use of renewable resources such as solar and wind power.

For example, consider that two-thirds of our oil consumption is for transportation. Experts agree that fuel-efficiency standards for new cars and light trucks could feasibly be raised to more than 40 miles per gallon by 2010. That would save 10 times as much oil as would likely be extracted from the Arctic refuge over the next 30 years. It also would mean a net economic gain for consumers of \$69 billion over the life of the vehicles, according to a 1998 American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy study. And it would be accompanied by a reduction in carbon dioxide pollution of more than 450 million tons per year—about a quarter of the reductions needed for the United States to meet the emission reduction goals established by the Kyoto Protocol.

In short, when it comes to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, I think that the stakes are too high and the odds are too long. I do not think we should gamble with the future of the refuge—especially since we have better options.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, some other speakers in this debate made statements about the legislative history of the current law that governs management of the coastal plain portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I think those statements deserve a brief response.

As we all know, relevant current law says the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is off-limits to drilling, and that only Congress can change that.

That relevant law is the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act—often called “ANILCA” or just the Alaska Lands Act.

My father, Mo Udall, was the chief House sponsor of that legislation.

During the time I have served in Congress, there has been some discussion about the history of the Alaska Lands Act and how its authors might vote if they were still Members of this Committee. And in particular, there have been suggestions that my father, if he were voting with us today, would oppose this amendment and support opening the coastal plain to drilling.

That’s an interesting thought. Of course, all we really know is that if things were different, they would be different. But I think that claim is not based on history.

I think that my father fact would oppose this legislation, because the law as it stands represents a compromise between two positions.

On the one hand were those who opposed drilling on the coastal plain because they thought it should be left alone. That was my father’s view, and that was what was provided in the Udall-Anderson bill passed by the House.

On the other hand, there were then, as there are now, people who thought oil and gas exploration and development should be permitted on the coastal plain.

The final compromise required a special study of the area’s energy potential to be followed by a recommendation about whether Congress should open the area to drilling. And, in the meantime, no drilling was allowed.

This compromise was worked out in the Senate. It passed there and came over to the House in the summer of 1980 but the House did not act on it until after that year’s elections. Then, in a lame-duck session, my father moved that the House concur in the Senate-passed bill—which the House did, on a voice vote. That sent it to President Carter, who signed it into law on December 2, 1980.

I have no doubt that my father and the other House champions of the Alaska Lands Act considered the compromise the best that could be achieved at that time.

I also have no doubt that they considered it acceptable only because there would not be any drilling in the coastal plain unless and until Congress specifically approved it. My father did not support drilling there in 1980. I do not think he would support it now.

Of course, the real issue here isn’t what happened in the past, but what will happen in the refuge in the future. That is up to us—not our predecessors—to decide. And as we do so, we are deciding not just for ourselves but also—and more importantly—for our children and their children.

But if people do want to consider some words from the past, I would direct their attention to the Interior Committee’s original report on the Alaska Lands Act, dated April 7, 1978.

On page 149, the report points out that “the Committee has noted the eloquent statements of a number of prominent Alaskans” about the idea of building a pipeline across the coastal plain.

And the report quotes the words of the senior Senator from Alaska, who “told the Council on Environmental Quality that ‘Some have appropriately compared [that idea] with slicing a razor blade across the face of the Mona Lisa.’”

I am not saying that the senior Senator from Alaska would oppose this legislation—on the contrary, I know he supports it. But I think that years ago he aptly described what will happen if the coastal plain is opened to drilling, and why I oppose letting that happen.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, even President Bush admits that this country’s addiction to oil is a crisis, but, like a desperate junkie, the Republican Congress is frantically trying one more time to squeeze every last drop out of our pristine wilderness. Mr. POMBO’s bill—which won’t have any meaningful impact on oil prices and which has no chance of passing the Senate—is a tragic reminder that the Republican Majority has lost the will to seriously govern this country. Drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) is Republicans’ reflex to high gas prices in the same way that banning gay marriage is their reflex to a disgruntled conservative base, and tax cuts are their reflex to sagging poll numbers. In the 11 years Republicans have worked to open ANWR, they could have instead begun to wean America off its dependence on unsustainable energy sources.

The Bush Administration’s own studies show that any oil derived from ANWR would amount to about 3.9 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil—a six-month supply for the U.S. Once drilling has violated the area, however, the natural habitat that once existed will be permanently ruined.

ANWR is the largest undeveloped wilderness left in our country. This 19 million acre coastal plain has been called “America’s Serengeti” because of its abundance of car-

ibou, polar bears, grizzly bears, snow geese, 135 species of migratory birds, eagles, wolves, sheep, and musk oxen. To destroy this natural treasure for six months of oil would be unconscionable.

I urge my colleagues to reject this sham once and for all so that after 11 years of lost time, we can finally get serious about renewable energy.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

Exploring for energy in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would be a major step toward energy independence for America.

Energy markets are uncertain and American consumers feel the pinch at the pump whenever there is the slightest market disruption.

American families should not have to risk their energy future on the whims of foreign dictators, rebel forces, and regimes that do not have America’s interests in mind.

From Venezuela, to Nigeria, to Saudi Arabia, America continues to gamble its economic future through dependence on foreign oil. The time to stop this is now.

The way to stop this is by increasing domestic production of oil.

The Energy Information Administration estimates that ANWR is capable of producing more than 1.5 million barrels of oil a day, more than U.S. imports from Saudi Arabia, or Venezuela on any given day.

This effort should not stop with ANWR. We must also explore the reserves that lie off of our shores in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The only way to secure our energy future is to utilize the resources we have here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 835, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. George Miller of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5429 to the Committee on Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 4(a) (page 7, line 23), insert the following: “For purposes of this subsection, a person shall not be treated as qualified to obtain such a lease if such person is a lessee under an existing lease issued by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note) that is not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to make sure that the taxpayers of this country and the owners of the Federal lands are not shortchanged if in fact ANWR will be opened in the future. Last week we discussed royalty relief, and we made the point that there are companies who have a royalty holiday. They do not pay royalties to the taxpayers of this country for the drilling on the lands that are owned by those taxpayers. In some cases, those companies may be able to escape almost all of the royalties on those lands.

We are simply saying to the Secretary of the Interior, if ANWR is opened, whether you are for it or against it, if ANWR is opened, those companies that continue to exploit the royalty holiday will not be allowed to bid for a lease in the ANWR, should it be leased. This is only fair to the taxpayers. An overwhelming bipartisan coalition voted for this last week on legislation. We seek to have that vote again to make sure.

We all know that oil is at \$70 a barrel. We know oil company profits are at record all-time highs. Yet nobody can figure out how to give the taxpayer a break.

The oil companies are not going to lower the price of gas or pay for the research in the bill yesterday, and now they are telling us they won't give back the royalty holiday that they are not entitled to. They are going to continue to exploit this loophole in the law, and then they want to bid on new resources. We simply say, enough is enough. We want to protect the taxpayers.

This is not about whether ANWR is open or whether ANWR remains closed; this is about the ethics and this is about the judgment of this Congress in dealing with these oil companies that seek to not only have their cake and eat it too, but to move on and get new cake from the taxpayers of this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, this recommittal motion goes right to the heart of what the Congress voted last week. Last week the Congress said that if oil companies that had received leases in the 1990s and in the early part of this century that are not paying any royalties on the oil which they drill out of public lands that would help to reduce the deficit, to pay for Medicare, to pay for Medicaid; if they are not going to pay royalties at \$60 a barrel, \$70 a barrel, \$80 a barrel, \$90 a barrel or \$100 a barrel on oil which is drilled on public lands that they already have leases on, that those companies should not be able to drill on public lands in an Arctic wildlife refuge and receive the benefit of drilling on public lands.

Either they renegotiate their old royalty agreements with the Federal Government that allow them to escape paying to the Federal Treasury, or

they will not get the benefit of drilling on public lands, especially if it is a wildlife refuge.

So that is what this is all about. And President Bush said in April there is no need for royalty relief at \$55 a barrel oil. We are talking about \$60, \$70, \$80, \$90 a barrel. This recommittal motion ensures that the American taxpayer will be protected.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, last week on the Hinchey amendment, where this issue was as straightforward as it is today, 67 Republicans joined 184 Democrats and overwhelmingly passed this amendment.

This amendment is a matter of simple fairness and equity, and it is to make sure that those people at these times of record profits who seek to exploit the loopholes in the law are not allowed to do that and get new leases from the taxpayers of this country in ANWR. That is simple fairness, it is simple equity, and the people of this country are entitled to it.

I would urge people to support the motion to recommit, and then the bill will go forward and people can decide on whether or not they want to drill in ANWR. I hope they don't, or, if they want to not do that, I hope they will make that decision. But that is independent of this fairness to the taxpayers, to the ratepayers, to the property owners in this country who own these lands that will be put out to bid, that we don't get fleeced twice by a couple of the oil companies that think they can have it both ways.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I do agree with one thing that my colleague and neighbor from California said, which is that this motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with ANWR, because it has absolutely nothing to do with ANWR. It is, again, a cynical attempt to try to kill the bill.

While I have to share his concerns over a so-called mistake that was made by the Clinton administration, that they forgot to put price triggers in when they were signing multiple leases with oil companies, they somehow forgot to put in those triggers that said when oil did reach \$55 a barrel that they wouldn't get royalty relief anymore. In the bill that they are trying to recommit, there is no royalty relief in the bill.

Again, the motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with the bill that they are trying to recommit.

What does concern me is that at this point, trying to kill the chance of creating 250,000 to 750,000 new American jobs, somehow that is okay for political gain, I imagine. It kills the chance to increase the amount of money to our Treasury by CRS' estimate of between \$111 billion and \$170 billion,

which far exceeds any royalties they would collect under this scheme that they have cooked up. It kills the chance to lower our dependence on foreign oil.

As I said in my closing, at some point they have to say "yes." At some point you have to say "yes" to new American energy. At some point you have to be for something. Being against everything is not an energy policy.

A cynical attempt to try to kill this bill again is not going to win this time. It hasn't won the 11 times before this, and it is not going to carry this time.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5441, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 836 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 836

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except: beginning with the comma on page 38, line 11 through "funds" on line 14; section 512; beginning with "or" on page 54, line 12 through "appropriation" on line 13; and section 536. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph or section, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph or section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph or section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of